



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



BR
1-
R33



N. S. Strassburger
Fittstown Pa

Handwritten text, likely a signature or name, appearing as a series of dark, irregular marks.

Reformed church review
=

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW:

PUBLISHED BY THE ALUMNI OF MARSHALL
COLLEGE.

VOLUME III.—1851.

Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam,—*Austin.*



MERCERSBURG, PA:
P. A. RICE, PRINTER, "JOURNAL" OFFICE.

—
1851.

24

Ry. St.
 3rd Ed.
 10-14-40
 41649

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

NO. I.

| Article. | Page. |
|--|-------|
| I. CATHOLICISM, - - - - - By J. W. Nevin, D. D., President of Marshall College. | 1 |
| II. SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE or A PLEA FOR THE LORD'S PORTION OF OUR INCREASE. 27 By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., Lancaster, Pa. | 27 |
| III. PROGRESS IN THE ART OF TRANSLATING, 43 By Prof. W. M. Nevin, Mercersburg, Pa. | 43 |
| IV. PECULIAR ATTRACTION OF JOHN'S GOSPEL, 52 [Translated from <i>Schaff's Kirchenfreund</i> ,] By Prof. E. V. Gerhart, Tiffin, Ohio. | 52 |
| V. LIEBNER'S CHRISTOLOGY, - - - - - 55 <i>Christologie, oder die christologische Einheit des dogmatischen systems, dargestellt von Dr. Th. A. Liebner. Erste Abtheilung, Goethingen 1849,</i> By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. | 55 |
| VI. RECOLLECTIONS OF NEANDER, - - - - - 73 By Prof. P. Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. | 73 |
| VII. SONNETS, - - - - - 91 By Prof. T. C. Porter, Mercersburg, Pa. | 91 |
| VIII. EUTHANASIA, - - - - - 92 By Prof. T. C. Porter, Mercersburg, Pa. | 92 |
| IX. ANGELS, - - - - - 93 [Translated from J. P. Lange.] | 93 |
| X. THE FOOT-PRINTS OF THE CREATOR, - 95 <i>The Foot-Prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepsis of Stromness</i> , by Hugh Miller, author of "The Old Red Sandstone," with a memoir of the author, by Lewis Agassiz. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, Boston. 1850 : pp. 337. By Prof. T. C. Porter, Mercersburg, Pa. | 95 |

- XI. THE POETRY OF SCIENCE,** - - - - 96
The Poetry of Science, by Robert Hunt, author of
 'Panthea,' 'Researches on Light,' &c. Gould,
 Kendall & Lincoln. Boston : 1850. pp. 388.
 By Prof. T. C. Porter, Mercersburg, Pa.
-

NO. II.

- XII. THE OLD PALATINATE LITURGY OF 1563,** 97
 [Continued from Vol. II. No III.]
 By Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, A. M., Easton, Pa.
- XIII. THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE,** - 129
 By Rev. F. D. Stem, A. M., Trenton, N. J.
- XIV. THE VERNAL ODES OF HORACE,** - - 144
 By Prof. W. M. Nevin, Mercersburg, Pa.
- XV. PRACTICAL EXEGESIS,** - - - - 152
 From an article by *Neander* in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift* of Berlin, for February, 1850.
 Translated by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.
- XVI. MODERN CIVILIZATION,** - - - - 165
Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their effects on the Civilization of Europe. Written in Spanish by the Rev. J. Balmes. Translated from the French. Baltimore : Published by John Murphy & Co. Pittsburg : George Quigley. 1851. 8vo. pp. 514.
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.
-

NO. III.

- XVII. THE VALUE OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS,** 209
 By Rev. T. Apple, Prof. in Marshall College.
- XVIII. CUR DEUS HOMO ?** - - - - 220
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.
- XIX. THE SCOTCH-IRISH ELEMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY,** - - - - 239
 By Rev. D. E. Nevin, Sewickley, Pa.
- XX. PONTIUS PILATE,** - - - - 255
 By D. H. Riddle, D. D., Pittsburg, Pa.

| | | |
|--|-----|------------|
| XXI. THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL, | - - | 265 |
| [Translated from <i>Schaff's Kirchen Geschichte</i> , By Prof. T. C. Porter, Mercersburg, Pa.] | | |
| XXII. LIFE OF THE REV. LEWIS MAYER, D. D., | | 275 |
| By Rev. Elias Heiner, D. D., Baltimore, Md. | | |
| XXIII. THE ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, | | 285 |
| <i>A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice.</i> By WILLIAM ADAMS, S. T. P., Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Wisconsin. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1850. pp. 379, 8vo. | | |
| By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. | | |
| XXIV. SCHAFF'S CHURCH HISTORY, | - - | 296 |
| Geschichte der christlichen Kirche von ihrer Gre- undung bis auf die Gegennart. Dargestellt von PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor der Theologie in Predi- ger seminar zu Mercersburg in Pennsylvania. Matth. xiii: 31-33. Erster Band; Die allgemeine Einleitung und die erste Periode, von Pfingstfest bis Zum Tode des heil. Johannes, (a. 30-100,) Mercersburg Pa.: Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Zu haben bei; Ernst Schäfer in Philadelphia und Leip- zig; Rudolph Garrigue in New-York. 1851. By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. | | |

NO. IV.

| | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| XXV. OUR NATIONAL RELIGION, | - - - | 205 |
| By Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, A. M., Easton, Pa. | | |
| XXVI. THE APOSTLE PETER, | - - - | 339 |
| An extract from Schaff's Church History. His Character. The Position of Peter in Church History. Peter in Rome. The testimonies in regard to Peter's settlement in Rome. The duration of Peter's settlement at Rome. The Martyrdom of Peter. Translated by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. | | |
| XXVII. THE ANGLICAN CRISIS, | - - - | 359 |
| By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. | | |

- XXVIII. MAYER'S CHURCH HISTORY,** - - - 398
History of the German Reformed Church, by Rev. LEWIS MAYER, D. D. Late Professor of the Theological Seminary of the German Ref. Church in the United States. *To which is prefixed a memoir of his Life.* by Rev. ELIAS HEINER, A. M. A minister of the First Reformed Congregation in Baltimore. Volume I. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. Pp. 461, 8vo.
 By Rev. E. Heiner, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

NO. V.

- XXIX. BAILEY'S FESTUS,** - - - - - 401
FESTUS: A Poem by PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. Barrister at Law. Ninth American Edition. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1850. 12mo. Pp. 412.
 By Rev. J. Clark, A. M., Chambersburg, Pa.
- XXX. THE CICADAÆ,** - - - - - 426
 By W. M. Nevin, Esq., Prof. in Marshall College.
- XXXI. THE NATURE OF THE REFORMATION AND ITS PREPARATION,** - - - - - 435
 [From the General Introduction of "Reformatorem vor der Reformation" by Dr. Ullmann.]
 Translated by Rev. J. S. Ermentrout, A. M., Mercersburg, Pa.
- XXXII. THE HOLY EUCHARIST,** - - - - - 446
 [Translated from Thiersch's Lectures.]
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.
- XXXIII. EARLY CHRISTIANITY,** - - - - - 461
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.
- XXXIV. ZACHARIAS URSINUS,** - - - - - 490
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.

NO. VI.

- XXXV. EARLY CHRISTIANITY,** - - - - - 513
 [Second Article.]
 By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| XXXVI. TRAPPER'S LIFE, | - - - - - | 563 |
| By Rev. D. E. Nevin, Sewickley, Pa. | | |
| XXXVII. REVERENCE AND RELIGION, | - - - - - | 583 |
| By Rev. T. Apple, Mercersburg, Pa. | | |
| XXXVIII. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHRIS- | - - - - - | 493 |
| TIAN NAME, | - - - - - | |
| A practical exposition of Acts ii: 26, "and the disciples were called christians first at Antioch." | | |
| [Translated from Schaff's Kirchenfreund.] | | |
| By Rev. J. W. Santee, Smithsburg, Md. | | |
| XXXIX. CHRISTIAN PRAYER. | - - - - - | 605 |
| John xvi: 24. And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you. | | |
| XXXX. KITTO'S CYCLOPÆDIA, | - - - - - | 616 |
| <i>The Popular Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature.</i> | | |
| By JOHN KITTO, D. D., F. S. A., Author of the 'Pictorial Bible' &c.; assisted by the Rev. JAMES TAYLOR, D. D., of Glasgow. <i>Illustrated by numerous engravings.</i> Boston: Published by Gould & Lincoln. 1851. Pp. 800, 8vo. | | |

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. I.

CATHOLICISM.

Among the attributes which Christianity has claimed to itself from the beginning, there is none perhaps more interesting and significant than that which is expressed by the title *Catholic*. It is not the product in any way of mere accident or caprice; just as little as the idea of the Church itself may be taken to have any origin of this sort. It has its necessity in the very conception of Christianity and the Church. Hence it is that we find it entering into the earliest christian confession the Apostles' Creed, as an essential element of the faith that springs from Christ. As the mystery of the Church itself is no object of mere speculation, and rests not in any outward sense or testimony only, but must be received as an article of faith which proceeds with inward necessity from the higher mystery of the Incarnation, so also the grand distinguishing attributes of the Church, as we have them in the Creed, carry with them the same kind of inward necessary force for the mind in which this Creed truly prevails. They are not brought from abroad, but spring directly from the constitution of the fact itself with which faith is here placed in communication. The idea of the Church as a real object for faith, and not a fantastic notion only for the imagination, involves the character of catholicity, as well as that of truth and holiness, as something which belongs inseparably

VOL. III.—NO. I. 1 *

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. I.

CATHOLICISM.

Among the attributes which Christianity has claimed to itself from the beginning, there is none perhaps more interesting and significant than that which is expressed by the title *Catholic*. It is not the product in any way of mere accident or caprice; just as little as the idea of the Church itself may be taken to have any origin of this sort. It has its necessity in the very conception of Christianity and the Church. Hence it is that we find it entering into the earliest christian confession the Apostles' Creed, as an essential element of the faith that springs from Christ. As the mystery of the Church itself is no object of mere speculation, and rests not in any outward sense or testimony only, but must be received as an article of faith which proceeds with inward necessity from the higher mystery of the Incarnation, so also the grand distinguishing attributes of the Church, as we have them in the Creed, carry with them the same kind of inward necessary force for the mind in which this Creed truly prevails. They are not brought from abroad, but spring directly from the constitution of the fact itself with which faith is here placed in communication. The idea of the Church as a real object for faith, and not a fantastic notion only for the imagination, involves the character of catholicity, as well as that of truth and holiness, as something which belongs inseparably

VOL. III.—NO. I. 1 •

to its very nature. To have true faith in the Church at all, we must receive it as one, holy, apostolical, and catholic. To let go any of these attributes in our thought, is necessarily to give up at the same time the being of the Church itself as an article of faith, and to substitute for it a mere chimera of our own brain under its sacred name. Hence the tenacity with which the Church has ever held fast to this title of *catholic*, as her inalienable distinction over against all mere parties or sects bearing the christian name. Had the title been only of accidental or artificial origin, no such stress would have been laid on it, and no such force would have been felt always to go along with its application. It has had its reason and authority all along, not so much in what it may have been made to mean exactly for the understanding in the way of formal definition and reflection, as in the living sense rather of christianity itself, the consciousness of faith here as that which goes before all reflection and furnishes the contents with which it is to be exercised.

The term catholic, it is generally understood, is of the same sense immediately with *universal*; and so we find some who are jealous of the first, as carrying to their ears a popish sound, affecting to use this last rather in the Creed. They feel it easier to say: "I believe in a holy universal or general church," than to adopt out and out the old form: "I believe in *the* holy catholic, or in *one* holy catholic, church." In this case however it needs to be borne in mind that there are two kinds of generality or universality, and that only one of them answers to the true force of the term catholic; so that there is some danger of bringing in by such change of terms an actual change of sense also, that shall go in the end to overthrow the proper import of the attribute altogether.

The two kinds of universality to which we refer are presented to us in the words *all* and *whole*. These are often taken to be substantially of one and the same meaning. In truth however their sense is very different. The first is an abstraction, derived from the contemplation or thought of a certain number of separate individual existences, which are brought together in the mind and classified collectively by the notion of their common properties. In such view, the general is of course something secondary to the individual existences from which it is abstracted, and it can never be more broad or comprehensive than these are in their numerical and empirical aggregation. It is ever accordingly a limited and finite generality. Thus we speak of *all* the trees in a forest, *all* the stars, *all* men, &c., meaning properly in each case the actual number of trees, stars,

or men, individually embraced at the time in our general view, neither more nor less, a totality which exists only by the mind and is strictly dependent on the objects considered in their individual character. We reach the conception by a process of induction, starting with single things, and by comparison and abstraction rising to what is general; while yet in the very nature of the case the generality can never transcend the true bounds of the empirical process out of which it grows and on which it rests. But widely different now from all this, is the conception legitimately expressed by the word *whole*. The generality it denotes is not abstract, a mere notion added to things outwardly by the mind, but concrete; it is wrought into the very nature of the things themselves, and they grow forth from it as the necessary and perpetual ground of their own being and life. In this way, it does not depend on individual and single existences as their product or consequence; although indeed it can have no place in the living world without them; but in the order of actual being they must be taken rather to depend on it, and to subsist in it and from it as their proper original. Such a generality is not finite, but infinite, that is without empirical limits and bounds; it is not the creature of mere experience, and so is not held to its particular measure however large, but in the form of idea is always more than the simple aggregate of things by which it is revealed at any given time in the world of sense. The *all* expresses a mechanical unity, which is made up of the parts that belong to it, by their being brought together in a purely outward way; the *whole* signifies on the contrary an organic unity, where the parts as such have no separate and independent existence, but draw their being from the universal unity itself in which they are comprehended, while they serve at the same time to bring it into view. The whole man for instance is not simply all the elements and powers that enter empirically into his constitution, but this living constitution itself rather as something more general than all such elements and powers, in virtue of which only they come to be thus what they are in fact. In the same way the whole of nature is by no means of one sense simply with the numerical aggregate, the actual all, of the objects and things that go to make up what we call the system of nature at any given time; and humanity or the human race as a whole may never be taken as identical with all men, whether this be understood of all the men of the present generation only or be so extended as to include all generations in the like outward view. Even where the thing in view may appear by its nature to exclude the general distinction here made, it will be found on

close consideration that where the terms before us are used at all appropriately they never have just the same sense, but that the whole of a thing implies always of right something more than is expressed merely by its all. The whole house is not of one signification with all the house, the whole watch with all its parts, or the whole library with all the certain books that are found upon its shelves. Two different ways of looking at the object, whatever it may be, are indicated by the two terms, and also two materially different conceptions, the force of which it is not difficult to feel even where there may be no power to make it clear for thought.

And now if it be asked which of these two orders of universality is intended by the title *catholic*, as applied to the christian Church, the answer is at once sufficiently plain. It is that which is expressed by the word *whole*, (a term that comes indeed etymologically from the same root,) and not that whose meaning lies more fitly in the word *all*. A man may say: "I believe in a holy universal Church;" when his meaning comes merely to this at last, that he puts all single christians together in his own mind, and is willing then to acknowledge them under this collective title. The universality thus reached however is only an abstraction, and as such falls short altogether of the living concrete mystery which is set before us as an object, not of reflection simply, but of divine supernatural faith, in the old eucumenical symbols. The true universality of Christ's kingdom is organic and concrete. It has a real historical existence in the world in and through the parts of which it is composed; while yet it is not in any way the sum simply or result of these, as though they could have a separate existence beyond and before such general fact; but rather it must be regarded as going before *them* in the order of actual being, as underlying them at every point, and as comprehending them always in its more ample range. It is the *whole*, in virtue of which only the parts entering into its constitution can have any real subsistence as parts, whether taken collectively or single. Such undoubtedly is the sense of the ancient formula, "I believe in the holy *catholic* church," as it meets us in the faith of the early christian world.

But the idea of wholeness is variously determined of course by the nature of the object to which it may be applied. We can speak of a whole forest, a whole continent, or a whole planet; of a whole species of animals, or of animated nature as a whole; of a whole man, a whole nation, a whole generation, or a whole human world. What now is the whole, in reference to which the attribute of the Church here under consideration is affirmed, as a necessary article of christian faith?

The only proper answer to this question is, that the attribute refers to the idea of universal humanity, or of this world as a whole. When christianity is declared to be *catholic*, the declaration must be taken in its full sense to affirm, that the last idea of this world as brought to its completion in man is made perfectly possible in the form of christianity, and in this form alone, and that this power therefore can never cease to work until it shall have actually taken possession of the world as a whole, and shall thus stand openly and clearly revealed as the true consummation of its nature and history in every other view.

The universalness here affirmed must be taken to extend in the end, of course, over the limits of man's nature abstractly considered, to the physical constitution of the surrounding world, according to Rom. viii, 19-23, 2 Peter iii, 13, and many other passages in the Bible; for the physical and moral are so bound together as a single whole in the organization of man's life, that the true and full redemption of this last would seem of itself to require a real *καταργησις* or renovation also of the earth in its natural form. The proper wholeness even of nature itself, ideally considered, lies ultimately in the power of christianity, and can be brought to pass or made actual only by its means. But it is more immediately and directly with the world of humanity as such that this power is concerned, and such reference is to be acknowledged too, no doubt, as mainly predominant in the ecclesiastical use of the title which we have now in hand. Christianity is catholic, and claims to be so received by an act of faith, inasmuch as it forms the true and proper wholeness of mankind, the round and full symmetrical *cosmos* of humanity, within which only its individual manifestations can ever become complete, and on the outside of which there is no room to think of man's life except as a failure.

There are two ways of looking at the human world, under the conception of its totality. The view may regard simply the area of the world's life outwardly considered, humanity in its numerical extent, as made up of a certain number of nations, tribes and individual men; or it may be directed more particularly to the world's life inwardly considered, humanity in its intensive character, the being of man as a living fact or constitution made up of certain elements, laws, forces and relations, which enter necessarily into its conception aside from the particular millions of living men as such by which it may be represented at any given time. These two conceptions are plainly different; while it is equally plain at the same time that neither of them may be allowed with any propriety to exclude the oth-

er, but that the true and real wholeness of humanity is to be found only in the union of both. Christianity or the Kingdom of God is catholic, as it carries in itself the power to take possession of the world both extensively and intensively, and can never rest short of this end. It is formed for such two fold victory over the reign of sin, and has a mission from heaven accordingly to conquer the universe of man's life in this whole and entire way.

Here precisely lies the *missionary* nature and character of the Church. It has a call to possess the world, and it is urged continually by its own constitution to fulfil this call. The spirit of missions, wherever it prevails, bears testimony to the catholicity of christianity, and rests on the assumption that it is the only absolutely true and normal form of man's life, and so of right should, and of necessity also at last must, come to be universally acknowledged and obeyed.

As regards the numerical view of the world, or its evangelization *in extenso*, this is generally admitted. All christians are ready to allow, that the world in this view belongs of right to Christ, and that it is his purpose and plan to take possession of it universally in the end as his own. The commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," at once makes it a duty to seek the extension of the gospel among all men, and authorizes the confident expectation that this extension will finally be reached. The world needs christianity, and it can never rest satisfied to be anything less than a full complement for this need. It has regard by its very nature, not to any section of humanity only, not to any particular nation or age or race, but to humanity as such, to the universal idea of man, as this includes all kindreds tribes and tongues under the whole heaven. "The field is the world." Christianity can tolerate no Heathenism, Mohammedanism, or Judaism at its side. It may not forego its right to the poorest or most outcast and degraded tribe upon the earth, in favor of any other religion. Wherever human life reaches, it claims the right of following it and embracing it in the way of redemption. The heathen are given to the Son for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. It is a sound and right feeling thus which enters into the cause of missions in its ordinary form, and leads the church to pray and put forth action in various ways for the conversion of the nations.

But it is not always so clearly seen, that the intensive mastery of the world's life belongs just as truly as this extensive work to the idea of the kingdom of God, and that it ought to be there-

fore just as much also an object of missionary interest and zeal. The two interests indeed can never be entirely separated; since it belongs to the very nature of christianity to take possession in some way of the interior life of men, and the idea of salvation by its means unavoidably involves something more than a simply outward relation to it under any form. Hence a mere outward profession of it is felt on all hands to be not enough; although even this as far as it goes forms a part also of that universal homage which is its due; but along with this is required to go also some transformation of character, as a necessary passport to the heavenly world towards which it looks. So in nominally christian lands, and within the bounds of the outward visible church itself, there is recognized generally the presence of a more inward living evangelization, a narrower missionary work, which consists in the form of what is sometimes called experimental religion, and has for its object the interior form of the life it pretends to take possession of, its actual substance, rather than the mere matter of it outwardly taken. In this country particularly no distinction is more familiar, than that between the mere outward acknowledgment of christianity and the power of religion in the souls of its true subjects; although the line of this distinction is more or less vaguely and variously drawn, to suit the fancy of different sects. But still it is for the most part a very inadequate apprehension after all, that seems to be taken in this way of the inner mission of christianity. Even under its experimental and spiritual aspect, the work of the gospel is too generally thought of as something comparatively outward to the proper life of man, and so a power exerted on it mechanically from abroad for its salvation, rather than a real redemption brought to pass in it from the inmost depths of its own nature. According to this view, the great purpose of the gospel is to save men from hell, and bring them to heaven; this is accomplished by the machinery of the atonement and justification by faith, carrying along with it a sort of magical supernatural change of state and character by the power of the Holy Ghost, in conformity with the use of certain means for the purpose on the part of men; and so now it is taken to be the great work of the Church to carry forward the process of deliverance, almost exclusively under such mechanical aspect, by urging and helping as many souls as possible in their separate individual character to flee from the wrath to come and to secure for themselves through the grace of conversion a good hope against the day of judgment. With many of our sects at least, the idea of religion, (evangelical or experimental religion as they are pleas-

ed to call it,) would seem to run out almost entirely into a sort of purely outward spiritualism in the form now noticed, with almost no regard whatever to the actual contents of our life as a concrete whole. Their zeal looks to the conversion of men in detail, after their own pattern and scheme of experience, as a life boat looks to the preservation of as many as possible from a drowning wreck ; but beyond this seems to be in a great measure without purpose or aim. Once converted and made safe in this magical way, the mission of the Church in regard to them, (unless it should be found necessary to convert them over again,) is felt to be virtually at an end ; and if only the whole world could be thus saved, there would be an end of the same mission for mankind altogether ; we should have the millennium, and to preserve it for a thousand years would only need afterwards to look well to the whole conversion of each new generation subsequently, as it might come of age for such purpose.

But, alas, how far short every such view falls of the true glorious idea of the kingdom of God among men, as it meets us in the Bible and in the necessary sense of the grand mystery of the Incarnation, on which the whole truth of the Bible rests.

Even in case of the individual man, singly and separately considered, the idea of redemption can never be answered by the imagination of a merely extensive salvation, a deliverance in the form of outward power, under any view. All admit, that his translation bodily as he now is in his natural state into heaven, would be for him no entrance really into a heavenly life. It is not in the power of locality or place of itself to set man in glory. Precisely the like contradiction is involved, (although it may not be at once so generally plain,) in the supposition of a wholly *ab extra* transformation of the redeemed subject into the heavenly form of existence. This at best would be the creation of a new subject altogether, as much as if a stone were raised by Divine fiat to the dignity of a living angel, and in no real sense whatever the redemption of the same subject into a higher order of life. No redemption in the case of man can be real, that is not from within as well as from without ; that is not brought to penetrate the inmost ground of his being, and that has not power to work itself forth from this, outwards and upwards, till it shall take possession finally of the whole periphery of his nature, body as well as soul. This in the very nature of the case is a process, answerable to the universal character of our present life. To conceive of it as something which is brought to pass suddenly and at once, without mediation and growth, is to sunder it from the actual constitution of humanity, to place

it on the outside of this, and so to reduce it, in spite of all spiritualistic pretensions the other way, to the character of a simply mechanical salvation that is at last no better than a dream. And it is of course much the same thing, to make the beginning here stand for the whole; and so to swell the starting point of the new life out of all right proportion, that instead of being, like the beginning of the natural life itself, in a great measure out of sight and knowledge, (or at most as a grain of mustard the least of all seeds,) it is made to stand forth to view empirically as the proper whole of salvation in this world, throwing the idea of the process which should follow completely into the shade, or turning it into dull unmeaning monotony and cant. Every such restriction of the idea of christianity to a single point of the christian life, even though it be the point where all individual salvation begins, is chargeable with deep and sore wrong to the idea as a whole, and cannot fail to be followed with disastrous consequences, wherever it may prevail, in some form of practical onesided divergency, more or less morbidly fanatical, from the true and proper course of the new creation in Christ. The full salvation of the man turns ultimately on his full sanctification; the kingdom of heaven must be in him as a reign of righteousness, in order that it may be revealed around him as a reign of glory. It must take up his nature into itself intensively, as heaven works itself into the whole measure of meal in which it is hid, in order that it may be truly commensurate with the full volume of his being outwardly considered. The new birth is the beginning of a progressive maturation, which has its full end only in the resurrection; and this last, bringing with it the glorification of the entire man, can be rationally anticipated, only as it is felt to have its real possibility in the power of such a whole renovation ripening before to this blessed result.

But to understand fully the inner mission of christianity now under consideration, we must look beyond the merely individual life as such to the moral organization of society, in which alone it can ever be found real and complete. Pure naked individuality in the case of man is an abstraction, for which there is no place whatever in the concrete human world. The single man is what he is always, only in virtue of the social life in which he is comprehended and of which he is a part. His separate existence is conditioned universally by a general human substance beyond it, from which it takes root, and derives both quality and strength. The idea of redemption then in his case, implies of necessity far more than any deliverance that can have place for his life separately regarded. As it must lay hold of

this as such in an inward way, in order to become outwardly actual, so also to do this effectually it must have power to reach and change the general substance of humanity out of which the individual life is found to spring. In other words, no redemption can be real for man singly taken, or for any particular man, which is not at the same time real for humanity in its collective view, for the fallen race as a whole. Hence it is that christianity, which challenges the homage of the world as such a system of real redemption, can never possibly be satisfied with the object of a simply numerical salvation, to be accomplished in favor of a certain number of individual men, an abstract election of single souls, whether this be taken as large or small, a few only or very many or even all of the human family. The idea of the true necessary wholeness of humanity is not helped at all, by the numerical extent of any such abstraction. It stands in the general nature of man, the human life collectively considered, as this underlies all such distribution, and goes before it in the order of existence, filling it with its proper organic force and sense in the constitution of society. Here especially comes into view the full form and scope of the work, which must take place intensively in the life of the world before the victory of the gospel can be regarded as complete. Humanity includes in its general organization certain orders and spheres of moral existence, that can never be sundered from its idea without overthrowing it altogether; they enter with essential necessity into its constitution, and are full as much part and parcel of it all the world over as the bones and sinews that go to make up the body of the outward man. The family for instance and the state, with the various domestic and civil relations that grow out of them, are not to be considered factitious or accidental institutions in any way, continued for the use of man's life from abroad and brought near to it only in an outward manner. They belong inherently to it; it can have no right or normal character without them; and any want of perfection in them, must even be to the same extent a want of perfection in the life itself as human, in which they are comprehended. So again the moral nature of man includes in its very conception the idea of art, the idea of science, the idea of business and trade. It carries in itself certain powers and demands that lead to these forms of existence, as the necessary evolution of its own inward sense. Humanity stands in the activity of reason and will, under their proper general character. Take away from it any interest or sphere which legitimately belongs to such activity, and in the same measure it must cease to be a true and sound humanity

altogether. No interest or sphere of this sort then can be allowed to remain on the outside of a system of redemption, which has for its object man as such in his fallen state. If christianity be indeed such a system, it must be commensurate in full with the constitution of humanity naturally considered ; it must have power to take up into itself not a part of this only but the whole of it, and by no possibility can it ever be satisfied with any less universal result.

All this we say falls to the inner mission of christianity, its destination to raise humanity inwardly considered to a higher power, a new quality and tone, as well as to take possession of it by territorial conquest from sea to sea and from pole to pole. And it needs to be well understood and kept in mind, that the first object here is full as needful as the second, and belongs quite as really to the cause of the world's evangelization. "The field is the world," we may say with quite as much solemnity and emphasis in this view, as when we speak of it under the other. As the kingdom of God is not restricted in its conception to any geographical limits or national distinctions, but has regard to mankind universally ; so neither is it to be thought of as penetrating the organization of man's nature only to a certain extent, taking up one part of it into its constitution and leaving another hopelessly on the outside ; on the contrary it must show itself sufficient to engross the whole. Nothing really human can be counted legitimately beyond its scope ; for the grand test of its truth is its absolute adequacy to cover the field of human existence at all points, its *catholicity* in the sense of measuring the entire length and breadth of man's nature. Either it is no redemption for humanity at all, or no constituent interest of humanity may be taken as extrinsical ever to its rightful domain. It will not do to talk of any such interest as profane, in the sense of an inward and abiding contrariety between it and the sacredness of religion ; as though religion might be regarded as one simply among other co-ordinate forms of life, with a certain territory assigned to it and all beyond foreign from its control. What is really human, a constitutive part of the original nature of man, may be indeed profaned, by being turned aside from its right use and end, but can never be in itself profane. On the contrary if religion be the perfection of this nature, all that belongs to it must not only admit but require an inward union with religion, in order to its own completion ; and as christianity is the end and consummation of all religion besides, it follows that such completion, in the case of every human interest, can be fully gained at last only in the bosom of its all comprehen-

sive life. The mission of christianity is, not to denounce and reject any order of life belonging to primitive humanity as intrinsically hostile to God, (that would be a species of Manichean fanaticism); nor yet to acknowledge it simply as a different and foreign jurisdiction; but plainly to appropriate every order to itself, by so mastering its inmost sense as to set it in full harmony with the deeper and broader law of its own presence. Art, science, commerce, politics, for instance, as they enter essentially into the idea of man, must all come within the range of this mission; and so far as it falls short of their full occupation at any given time with the power of its own divine principle, it must be regarded as a work still in 'process only towards its proper end; just as really as the work of outward missions is thus in process also, and short of its end, so long as any part of the world remains shrouded in pagan darkness. It is full as needful for the complete and final triumph of the gospel among men, that it should subdue the arts, music, painting, sculpture, poetry, &c., to its sceptre, and fill them with its spirit as that it should conquer in similar style the tribes of Africa or the islands of the South Sea. Every region of science, as it belongs to man's nature, belongs also to the empire of Christ; and this can never be complete, as long as any such region may remain unoccupied by its power. Philosophy too, whose province and need it is to bring all the sciences to unity and thus to fathom their deepest and last sense, falls of right under the same view. Some indeed pretend, that christianity and philosophy have properly nothing to do with each other; that the first puts contempt on the second; that the second in truth is a mere *ignis fatuus* at most, which all good christians are bound to abhor and avoid. But if so, it must be considered against humanity to speculate at all in this way; whereas the whole history of the world proves the contrary; and it lies also in the very idea of science, that knowledge in this form should be sought as the necessary completion of it under other forms. To pronounce philosophy against humanity, is virtually to place science universally under the like condemnation. And so to treat it as profane or impertinent for the kingdom of God, is in truth to set all science in similar relation; the very result, to which fanaticism has often shown itself prone to run. But what can be well more monstrous than that; or more certainly fatal in the end to the cause of christianity? Philosophy, like science and art in other forms, is of one birth with man's nature itself; and if christianity be the last true and full sense of this nature, it is not possible that it should be either willing or able to shut it out from its realm.

We might as soon dream of a like exclusion towards the empire of China ; for it is hard to see surely how the idea of humanity would suffer a more serious truncation by this, than by being doomed to fall short of its own proper actualization the other way. The world without China would be quite as near perfection, we think, as the world without philosophy. Its full redemption and salvation, the grand object of the gospel and so the necessary work and mission of christianity among men, includes it is plain both interests, and we have no right to magnify the one ever at the cost of the other.

Such being the general nature of this missionary work intensively taken, we may see at once how far it is still from its own proper end even in the case of the nominally christian world itself. It is melancholy to think, that after nearly two thousand years which have passed since Christ came, so large a part of the human race should still be found beyond the line of christianity outwardly considered. But it is not always properly laid to heart, that the short-coming in the other view, the distance between idea and fact within this line, is to say the least no less serious and great. If when we think of the millions of Africa, India, and China, we must feel that the gospel thus far has been only in progress towards its full triumphant manifestation in the world ; this feeling must prevail no less, when we direct our attention to the moral, scientific, and political fields, which all around us appear in like barbarous estrangement from its inward law. In this view, even more emphatically than in the other, may we not adopt the language, Heb. ii : 8 : " We see not yet *all things* put in subjection under him"—though nothing less than such universal subjection be needed to carry out the first sense of man's life, (Gen. i : 26, Ps. viii : 6-8) and so nothing less can satisfy the enterprise of his redemption ? Alas, how quite the reverse of this are we made to behold in every direction. Not alone do the wild powers of nature refuse to obey at once the will of the saints, but it is only a most partial dominion at best also that the christian principle has yet won for itself even in the moral world. Whole territories and spheres of human life here, have never yet been brought to any true inward reconciliation and union with the life of the Church. Romanism has pretended indeed to bring them into subjection ; but so far as the pretension has yet been made good, it has been ever in a more or less outward and violent way only ; whereas the problem from its very nature requires that the relation should be one of free loving harmony and not one of force. Protestantism seeing this, has in large measure openly surrendered the

whole point ; falling over thus to the opposite extreme ; carrying the doctrine of freedom so far, that it is made not only to allow, but even to justify in many cases, a full dissociation of certain spheres of humanity from the rightful sovereignty of religion. In our own time especially there is a fearful tendency at work under this form, which rests throughout on the rationalistic assumption that christianity has no right to the universal lordship of man's life, and which aims at nothing less accordingly than the emancipation of all secular interests from its jurisdiction. It has become a widely settled maxim, we may say, that whole vast regions of humanity lie naturally and of right on the outside of the kingdom of God, strictly taken, and that it must ever be wrong to think of stretching its authority over them in any real form. Hence we find the arts and sciences to a great extent sundered from the idea of the Church as such ; and more particularly politics and religion are taken to be totally separate spheres. It is coming to seem indeed a sort of moral truism, too plain for even children or fools to call in question, that the total disruption of Church and State, involving the full independence of all political interests over against the authority of the new constitution of things brought to pass in Christ, is the only order that can at all deserve to be respected as rational, or that may be taken as at all answerable to man's nature and God's will. And yet what a conception is that of christianity, which excludes from its organic jurisdiction the broad vast conception of the Commonwealth or State ! We may say, if we please, that such dissociation is wise and necessary for the time being, and as an interimistic transitional stadium in a process that looks towards a far different ulterior end ; but surely we are bound to pronounce it always in its own nature wrong, and false to the true idea of the gospel ; something therefore which marks not the perfection, but the serious imperfection rather, of the actual state of the world. The imagination that the last answer to the great question of the right relation of the Church to the State, is to be found in any theory by which the one is set completely on the outside of the other must be counted essentially antichristian. Christianity owns the proper freedom of man's nature under its common secular aspects, and can never be satisfied with the violent subjugation of it in a merely outward way ; but it requires at the same time that this shall be brought to bow to its authority without force ; and it can never acknowledge any freedom as legitimate and true, that may affect to hold under a different form. So far short then as its actual reign in the world is found to fall of this universal supremacy over all

the interests of life, it must be regarded as not having yet reached its proper end, as being still in the midst of an unfulfilled mission.

Of the two parables setting forth the progressive character of the kingdom of God, Matth. xiii : 31-33, it is not unnatural to understand the first, that of the mustard seed namely, as referring mainly to its extensive growth, while the other, that of the leaven hid in three measures of meal, is taken to have respect rather to this intensive growth, by which the new divine nature of christianity is required to penetrate and pervade always more and more the substance of our general human life itself, with a necessity that can never stop till the whole mass be wrought into the same complexion. It is certain at all events, that the parables together refer to both forms of increase ; for the mere taking of volume outwardly is just as little sufficient of itself to complete the conception of organic growth in the world of grace, as it is notoriously to complete the same conception in the world of nature. The taking of volume must be joined in either case with a parallel progressive taking of answerable inward form. The growth of the mustard seed itself involves this two-fold process ; for it consists not simply in the accumulation of size, but in the assumption at the same time of a certain type of vegetable life throughout the entire compass of its leaves and branches. It is however more particularly the image of leaven, that serves to bring out this last side of the subject in all its force, and that might seem accordingly to be specially designed for this purpose, in distinction from all regard to the other more outward view. The parallel, as in the case of all the N. T. parables, is no mere fancy or conceit, but rests on a real analogy, by which a lower truth or fact in the sphere of nature is found to foreshadow and as it were anticipate a higher one in the sphere of the spirit. Leaven is a new force introduced into the mass of meal, different from it, and yet having with it such inward affinity that it cannot fail to become one with it, and in doing so to raise it at the same time into its own higher nature. This however comes to pass, not abruptly nor violently, but silently and gradually, and in such a way that the action of the meal itself is made to assist and carry forward the work of the leaven towards its proper end. The work thus is a process, the growing of the new principle continually more and more into the nature of the meal, till the whole is leavened. And so it is with the new order of life revealed through the gospel. Involving as it does from the start a higher form of existence for humanity as a whole, (new and yet of kindred relation to the old,) it is

still not at once the transformation of it, in a whole and sudden way, into such higher state. It must grow itself progressively into our nature, taking this up by degrees into its own sphere and bringing out thus at the same time its own full significance and power, in order to take possession of our nature at all in any real way. In the case of the single believer accordingly it is like leaven, a power commensurate from the first with the entire mass of his being, but needing always time and development for its full actual occupation; and so also in the case of our human life as a social or moral whole. Christianity is from the very outset potentially the reconstruction or new creation of man's universal nature, (including all spheres and tracts of existence which of right belong to this idea,) just as really as a deposit of leaven carries in it from the first the power of transformation for the whole mass of meal in which it has been hid; but it is like leaven again also in this respect, that the force which it has potentially needs a continuous process of inward action to gain in a real way finally its own end. There is an inner mission in its way here, which grows with as much necessity out of its relation to the world, as the mission it has to overshadow the whole earth with its branches, and which it is urged too with just as much necessity, we may add, to carry forward and fulfil. The prayer, *Thy kingdom come*, has regard to the one object quite as much as to the other. This comes by the depth of its entrance into the substance of humanity, as well as by the length and breadth of it, as a process of intensification no less than a process of diffusion.

And it deserves to be well considered, that these two processes are not just two different necessities, set one by the side of the other in an external way; that they are to be viewed rather as different sides only of one and the same necessity; since each enters as a condition into the fulfilment of the other, and neither can be rightly regarded without a due regard to both. The power of christianity in particular to take possession of the world extensively, depends at last on the entrance it has gained into the life of the world intensively, so far as it may have already come to prevail. And it may well be doubted, whether it can ever complete its outward mission, in the reduction of all nations to the obedience of the gospel, without at least a somewhat parallel accomplishment of its inward mission, in the actual christianization of the organic substance of humanity, to an extent far beyond all that is now presented within the bounds of the outward Church. The leaven masters the volume of the meal in which it is set, only by working itself fully into its in-

most nature. The conversion of the world in the same way is to be expected, not just from the multiplication of individual converts to the christian faith, till it shall become thus of one measure with the earth, but as the result rather of an actual taking up at the same time of the living economy of the world more and more into the christian sphere. The imagination that the outward mission here may be carried through first, and the inner mission left behind as a work for future leisure, is completely preposterous. The problems then which fall to this last have a direct and most important bearing always, on the successful prosecution also of the object proposed to the first. To make the reign of Christ more deep and inward for the life of the world, is at the same time to prepare the way correspondingly for its becoming more broad and wide. The proper solution of a great theoretic question, lying at the foundation of the christian life, and drawing after it consequences that reach over nations and centuries, may be of more account for the ultimate issues of history, than the present evangelization of a whole continent like Africa. At this very time it is of more account far, that the power of christianity should be wrought intensively into the whole civilization of this country, (the weight of which prospectively no one can fully estimate); that it should have in it not merely an outward and nominal sovereignty, but be brought also fully to actuate and inform its interior collective life, filling its institutions as their very soul, and leavening them throughout into its own divine complexion; that it should solve the problem of Church and State in a really christian way, so as to bind them into one with free inward reconciliation, instead of throwing them hopelessly apart; that it should take possession truly of the art and literature of the country, its commerce and science and philosophy as well as its politics, passing by no tract of humanity as profane and yet acknowledging no tract as legitimate on the outside of its own sphere and sway: all this, we say, is an object far more near to the final redemption of the world, and of far more need at this time, (if it might be accomplished,) for the bringing in of the millenium, than the conversion of all India or China. The life of the Church is the salvation of the world.

From the whole subject we draw in conclusion the following reflections:

1. From the view now taken of the proper catholicism or wholeness of christianity, we may see at once that it by no means implies the necessary salvation of all men. This false conclusion is drawn by Universalists, only by confounding the

idea of the whole with the notion of all ; whereas in truth they are of altogether different force and sense. As hundreds of blossoms may fall and perish from a tree, without impairing the true idea of its whole life as this is reached finally in the fruit towards which all tends from the beginning, so may we conceive also of multitudes of men born into the world, the natural posterity of Adam, and coming short of the proper sense of their own nature as this is completed in Christ, without any diminution whatever of its true universalness under such form. Even in the case of our natural humanity, the whole in which it consists is by no means of one measure merely with the number of persons included in it ; it is potentially far more than this, being determined to its actual extent by manifold limitations that have no necessity in itself ; for there might be thousands besides born into the world, which are never born into it in fact. Why then should it be thought that the higher form of this same humanity which is reached by Christ, and without which the other must always fall short of its own destination, in order to be full and universal in its own character must take up into itself literally all men ? Why may not thousands fail to be born permanently into this higher power of our universal nature, just as thousands fail of a full birth also into its first natural power, without any excluding limitation in the character of the power itself ? Those who thus fail in the case of the second creation fail at the same time of course of the true end of their own being, and so may be said to perish more really than those who fall short of an actual human life in the first form ; yet it by no means follows from this again that such failure must involve annihilation or a return to non-existence. It may be a continuation of existence ; but of existence under a curse, morally crippled and crushed, and hopelessly debarred from the sphere in which it was required to become complete. To be thus out of Christ is for the subjects of such failure indeed an exclusion from the true and full idea of humanity, the glorious orb of man's life in its last and only absolute and eternally perfect form ; but for this life itself it involves no limitation or defect. The orb is at all points round and full.

2. As the wholeness in question is not one with the numerical all of the natural posterity of Adam, so neither may it be taken again as answerable simply to any less given number, selected out of the other all for the purpose of salvation. This idea of an abstract election, underlying the whole plan of redemption, and circumscribing consequently the real virtue of all its provisions by such mechanical limitation, is in all material

respects the exact counterpart of that scheme of universal salvation which has just been noticed. It amounts to nothing, so far as the nature of the redemption is concerned, that it is made to be for all men in one case and only for a certain part of them in the other. In both cases a mere notional all, a fixed finite abstraction, is substituted for the idea of an infinite concrete whole, and the result is a mechanical *ab extra* salvation, instead of a true organic redemption unfolding itself as the power of a new life from within. The proper wholeness of christianity is more a great deal than any arithmetical sum, previously made up under another form, for its comprehension and use. It implies parts of course, and in this way at last definite number and measure, and so in the case of its subjects also a veritable "election of grace;" but it makes all the difference in the world, whether the parts are taken to be the factorial making up of the whole, or come into view as its product and growth, whether their number and measure be settled by an outward election or determined by an election that springs from within. A tree has a definite number of branches and leaves—so many, and not more nor less; but who would think of looking for the ground of this beyond the nature of the tree itself, and the conditions that rule the actual development of its life? The law of determination here is something very different, from the law that determines the imitation of a tree in wax or the composition of a watch. So the election of grace in the case of the new creation holds *in Christ*, and not in any view taken of humanity aside from his person.

3. The catholic or universal character of the Church thus, we may easily see farther, does not depend at any time upon its merely numerical extent, whether this be large or small. An organic whole continues the same, (the mustard seed for instance,) through all stages of its development, though for a long time its actual volume and form may fall far short of what they are destined to be in the end, and must be too in order to fulfil completely its inward sense. So the *whole* fact of christianity gathers itself up fundamentally into the single person of Christ, and is found to grow forth from this literally as its root. The mystery of the incarnation involves in itself potentially a new order of existence for the world, which is as universal in its own nature as the idea of humanity, and by which only it is possible for this to be advanced finally to its own full and perfect realization. Those who affect to find this unintelligibly mystical and transcendental, would do well to consider that every higher order of existence, even in the sphere of nature itself, carries in

it a precisely similar relation to the mass of matter, surrounding it under a lower form, which it is appointed to take up and transform by assimilation into its own superior type. The Second Adam is the root of the full tree of humanity in a far profounder sense than the First; and it is only as the material of it naturally considered comes to be incorporated into this, that it can be said to be raised into the same sphere at all; its relation to it previously being at best but that of the unleavened meal to the new power at work in its bosom, or that of the unassimilated element to the buried grain which is destined by means of it to wax into the proportions of a great plant or tree. So too from the root upwards, from the fountain onwards, the new order of life which we call the Church or the Kingdom of God remains throughout one and catholic. It owns no co-ordination with the idea of man's life under any different form. It is the ultimate universal sense of man's nature, the entire sphere of its perfection, the whole and only law of its final consummation. With this character however, the Church can never be content to rest in a merely partial revelation of its power among men, but is urged continually by its very nature to take actual possession of all the world, as we have already seen, both extensively and intensively. Here we have of course the idea of a process, as something involved in the very conception itself which we have in hand. As an article of faith, the catholicity of the Church expresses a present attribute in all ages; it is not drawn simply from the future, as a proleptical declaration of what is to be true hereafter, though it be not true now; the *whole* presence of the new creation is lodged in its constitution from the start, and through all centuries. But who will pretend that this has ever yet had its proper actualization in the living world? The catholic quality and force of christianity go always along with it; but invulnerable hindrances are at hand to obstruct and oppose its action; and its full victory in this view accordingly, as well as in the view of its other attributes, is to be expected only hereafter. To believe in the Church as universal or catholic, it is not necessary that we should see it in full actual possession of the whole world; for when has that been the case yet, and what less would it be than the presence of the millenium in the most absolute sense? It is to believe however that the whole power by which this is to be reached is already at work in its constitution, and that its action looks and strives always towards such end, as the only result that can fairly express its necessary inward meaning and truth.

4. The catholicity of the Church, as now described, involves of

course the idea also of its unity and exclusiveness. As being the true whole of humanity, it can admit no rival or co-ordinate form of life, (much less any more deep and so more comprehensive than itself,) and it must necessarily exclude thus as false and contrary to humanity itself all that may affect to represent this beyond its own range and sphere.

5. No other order of human life can have the same character. It is not of the nature of the civil state or commonwealth, to be thus catholic; and still less does it belong to any single constituent sphere of such political organization, separately taken. Even religion, which claims to be the last sense of man's life from the start, and which is therefore in consistency bound and urged under all forms to assert some sort of whole or universal title in its own favor, is found to be in truth unequal always to this high pretension, till it comes to its own proper and 'only sufficient completion in Christ. No system of Paganism of course could ever be catholic. So a catholic Mohammedanism is a contradiction in terms. More than this, it never lay in the nature of Judaism itself, with all its truth, to take up into itself the whole life of the world. To do so, it must pass into a higher form, and so lose its own distinctive character, in Christianity. No faith could say truly: "I believe in a holy catholic-Judaism"—even if all nations were brought to submit to circumcision before its eyes; for it is not in the power of Judaism as such to possess and represent in full harmony the *whole* idea of humanity; and what is thus not in itself possible, and so not true, can never be the object really of faith in its true form. Judaism is not the deepest power of man's life in the form of religion, and for this reason alone it must be found in the end a comparatively partial and relative power; leaving room for a different consciousness over against itself, with a certain amount of legitimacy and right too in the face of its narrow claims, under the general form of Gentilism. This contradiction is brought to an end in Christ, (the true Peace of the world, as we have it Eph. ii: 14-18.) in and by whom religion, the inmost fact of man's nature, is carried at once to its last and most perfect significance, and so to the lowest profound of this nature at the same time; with power thus to take up the entire truth of it into its own universally comprehensive law; healing its disorders, restoring its harmony, and raising it finally to immortality and glory. Only what is in this way deeper than all besides, can be at the same time truly catholic, of one measure with the whole compass and contents of our universal life.

6. As no other form of religion *can* be catholic, so it lies in

the very nature of Christianity, as here shown, to have this character. It *must* be catholic. Conceive of it, or try to exhibit it, as in its constitution less comprehensive than the whole nature of man, or as not sufficient to take this up universally into its sphere of redemption, and you wrong it in its inmost idea. It must be commensurate with the need and misery of the world as a whole, or come under its own reproach of having begun to build where it has no power to finish. Say, that it is for all mankind, except the Malay race or the many millions of China; and our whole sense at once revolts against the declaration as monstrous. Substitute for such geographical limitation the notion of an invisible line, in the form of an outward unconditional decree, setting a part of the race on one side in a state of real salvability, and another part of it on the other side in a state of necessary reprobation, the atonement being in its own nature available or of actual force in one direction only and not in the other; and the spirit of the whole New Testament again rises into solemn protest. Under the same general view again it is monstrous, as we have already seen, to conceive of a line being interposed in the way of Christianity, in the interior organism of man's general nature itself; leaving one tract of it free to the occupancy of this new power, but requiring it to stop on the frontier limits of another, (politics, trade, science, art, philosophy); as though it were deep enough and broad enough to take in a part of the great fact of humanity only, but not the whole. Or take now finally another form of limitation, not unfrequently forced on the idea of what is called the Church in these last days. Suppose a line cutting the universal process of humanity, as a fact never at rest but in motion always from infancy to old age, into two great sections; for the one of which only there is room or place in the restorational system here under consideration, while the other including all infants is hopelessly out of its reach—unless death so intervene as to make that possible in another world by God's power, which is not possible here by his grace. Is the thought less monstrous, we ask, than any of the suppositions which have gone before? The redemption of the gospel, as it is the absolute end of all religion besides and the full destiny of man, cannot be less broad in its own nature than the whole life it proposes to renovate and redeem. Shall there be imagined any room or place in this for the dark reign of sin—any island of the sea, any remote nation or tribe, any reprobate caste, any outside moral tract, any stadium of infancy or unripe childhood—where the reign of grace, (formed to overwhelm it, Rom. v: 15-21,) has no power to follow and make

itself triumphantly felt? That were indeed to wrong this kingdom in its primary conception. It must be catholic, the true whole of God's image in man, the recovery of it potentially from the centre of his nature out to its farthest periphery, in order to be itself the truth and no lie.

7. As the attribute of catholicity is distinctively characteristic of the Church as such, it follows that no mere sect or fragment of this can effectively appropriate the title. The idea of a sect is, that a part of the christian world has been brought to cut itself off from the rest of it, on the ground of some particular doctrinal or practical interest, and now affects to have within itself under such isolated view all church powers and resources, though admitting at the same time the existence of such powers & resources in other bodies also with which it owns no real church union. This is a vast contradiction from the very start, which is found to work itself out afterwards into all sorts of anomaly and falsehood. The sect virtually puts itself always into the place of the Church, and in spite of its own principle of division is then forced to arrogate to itself the proper rights and prerogatives of this divine organization, as though it were identical with its own narrow limits. In other words, it is forced to act as the whole, when it is in truth by its own confession again only a segment or part. So far as any remnant of church feeling remains, (such as is needed for instance to distinguish a sect in its own mind from a voluntary confederation for religious ends,) it must necessarily include in it the idea of catholicity or wholeness, as an indestructible quality of such thought; for as it lies in the very conception of a sphere to be round, so precisely does it lie in the very conception of the Church to be catholic, that is to be as universal in its constitution as humanity itself, with no tract or sphere beyond. Hence every sect, in pretending to be sufficient within itself for all church ends, practically at least if not theoretically asserts in its own favor powers and prerogatives that are strictly universal, as broad as the idea of religion itself under its most perfect and absolute form; an assumption that goes virtually to deny and set aside all similar church character in the case of other sects; for the case forbids the notion of two or more systems, separately clothed with the same universal force. Nothing short of such claim to exclusive wholeness is involved in the right each sect asserts for itself, to settle doctrines, make laws, and ply the keys, in a way that is held to be for the bounds of its own communion absolutely whole and final. Such ecclesiastical acts either mean nothing, sink into the character of idle sham, or else they are set forth as the utterances of

a real church authority which is taken to be as wide as the idea of the Church itself. Every sect in this way, so far as it secretly owns the power of this idea, puts on in mock proportion at least all the airs of Rome. But now, on the other hand, the inward posture of every sect again, as such, is at war with catholicity, and urges it also to glory in the fact. The sect mind roots itself in some subjective interest, made to take the place of the true objective whole of christianity, and around this it affects to revolve pedantically as an independent world or sphere. Then it is content to allow other spheres beyond itself, under the like independent form. So its universal rights and powers as we had them just before, (rights and powers that mean nothing ecclesiastically save as they *are* thus catholic and not partial,) shrink into given bounds; often ridiculously narrow; much like the power of those old heathen deities, whose universal sway was held to stop short with the limits of the nation that worshipped at their shrines. It is a power dogmatical, diatactical, and diacritical, as they call it, which is of full conclusive force, (the "keys of the kingdom of heaven,") for one man but not for another his next neighbor; for James but not for John; for such as have agreed to own it but not for those who have been pleased to own a different church; universal as the boundaries of the particular denomination from which it springs, the numerical all of a given sect, but of no force whatever beyond this for the mighty whole of which the sect is confessedly only a fraction and part. Here comes out of course the inward lie of the sect system, forcing it to falsify on one side what it affirms of itself on another. Sects are constitutionally uncatholic. Commonly they dislike even the word, and are apt to be shy of it, as though it smacked of Romanism, and as having a secret consciousness that it expresses a quality of the Church which their position disowns. By this however they in truth condemn themselves. It is the very curse of sect, to bear testimony here to the true idea of the Church, while it must still cry out, What have I to do with thee thou perfection of beauty! No sect as such has power to be catholic; just as little at least as Judaism has ever had any such power. No one can say truly: "I believe in a holy catholic Lutheranism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, or any like partial form of the christian profession," as he may say: "I believe in the holy catholic Church." For every such interest owns itself to be a part only of what the full fact of christianity includes, and is so plainly in its own nature. How then should it ever be for faith the whole? What sect of those now existing, Lutheran, German Reformed, Methodist,

etc., can seriously expect ever to take up the universal world of man's life into its bosom—unless by undergoing at last such a change in its own constitution, as shall cause the notion of sect to lose itself altogether in another far higher and far more glorious conception? No such has faith, or can have faith, in any universality of this sort as appertaining to itself; for to have it, would be to feel in the same measure a corresponding right and necessity to extend its authority over the whole world; which we know is not the case. It belongs to that which is in its own nature universal, to lay its hand imperatively on what it is found to embrace. Catholicity asks willing subjects indeed, but not optional. It says not, you may be mine, but you must. The true whole is at the same time inwardly and forever necessary. But what sect thinks of being catholic in this style? Is it not counted catholic rather in the sect vocabulary, to waive altogether the idea of any such universal and necessary right, and to say virtually: "We shall be happy to take charge of you if you see fit to be ours—but if not, may God speed you under some different conduct and care!" Not only the sect itself, but the sect consciousness also, the sect mind, is constitutionally fractional, an arbitrary part which can by no possibility feel or act as a necessary whole.

8. In this way we are brought finally to see the difference, between the true catholicism of christianity, and the mock liberalism which the world is so fond of parading on all sides in its name. This last appears in very different forms, though it ends always in the same general sense. Sometimes it openly substitutes the idea of mere humanism for that of christianity, and so prates of the universal brotherhood of man, as though this were identical with the kingdom of God, and sentimental philanthropy the same thing with religion. In another shape, it is found preaching toleration among opposing sects, exhorting them to lay aside their asperities and endeavoring it may be to bring them to some sort of free and independent confederation, (such as the Peace Society aims at among nations,) that shall prove the Church one in spite of its divisions. Then again it comes before us in the character of an open war against all sects, calling upon men to forsake them as in their very nature uncatholic, and to range themselves under the standard of general christianity, with no creed but the Bible and no rule for the use of it but private judgment. And here it is that the spirit in question often comes to look like an angel of light, by contrast with the demon of sectarianism which it pretends to cast out; so that to many it seems impossible to distinguish it from the true genius

of catholicity itself, as we are taught to acknowledge this in the old church Creed. But there is just this world-wide difference between the two, that the one is positive and concrete, while the other in all its shapes is purely negative and so without real substance altogether. This is at once apparent, where mere philanthropism is made to stand for religion; the liberality it affects has indeed no limits, but it is just because the religion it represents has no contents; it is of one measure with the natural life of man, because it adds nothing to this and has no power whatever to lift it into any higher sphere. The same vast defect however goes along with the pseudo-catholic theory also, in its other more plausible forms. The universality it proposes is not made to rest in the idea of the Church itself, as the presence of a real concrete power in the world, with capacity and mission to raise the natural life of man to a higher order, (the *Body of Christ*), which in such view implies historical substance, carrying in itself the laws and conditions of its own being; which men may believe, but have no ability to make, more than they may pretend to make the natural world: not in this is it made to rest, we say, the indubitable sense of the old Creed, but in the conception rather of the mere outward all of a certain number of men, or parties of men in world convention represented, who consent to be of one mind in the main on the great subject of the gospel, and only need to extend such voluntary association far enough to take in finally the entire human family. All ends in an abstraction, which resolves itself at last simply into the notion of humanity in its natural character, as bringing into it no new whole whatever for its organic elevation to a higher sphere. There is no mystery accordingly ever in this pseudo-catholicism; it needs no faith for its apprehension; but on the contrary falls in readily with every sort of rationalistic tendency and habit. Sects too, that hate catholicism in the true sense, find it very easy to be on good terms with it under such mock form; the most unchurchly and uncatholic among them, taking the lead ordinarily in all sorts of buttery twaddle and sham in the name of christian union. The purely negative character of the spirit is farther shown, in its open disregard for all past history. It acknowledges no authority in this form, no confession, no creed: but will have it, that christianity is something to be produced by all men, in every age, as a new fact fresh from the Bible *and themselves*. But how then can it be taken to have any substance of its own in the actual world, any wholeness that is truly concrete, and not simply notional and abstract? Catholic and historical, (which at last means also apostolical,) go necessarily hand in hand together.

J. W. N.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE,
OR
A PLEA FOR THE LORD'S PORTION OF OUR INCREASE.

RELIGION is like the sheaf in Joseph's dream to which all the sheaves of his brethren bowed and did obeisance. To it all other interests must bend and be subordinate. As the soul is more valuable than the body, as eternity is longer than time, as the claims of God are higher than all other claims, and as the motives to religion are stronger than all other motives, it is plain that religion must be to every one the first and highest interest of life. To secure this pearl of great price it is wisdom to part with all that we have; and when we are in possession of it, we are required to use the same diligence to extend its blessings to others as we used to obtain it ourselves, for we are to love our neighbors as ourselves. It is the duty, then, of every christian to make the spread of Christ's kingdom his highest care, and to make interest, ease, and all other claims bend to this one great duty. No christian liveth to himself, he lives for others. Not only at his convenience, but to the utmost verge of self-denial and self-sacrifice must he employ his talents, influence, and wealth, to bless others.

There is at this time much religion which lacks the spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice, and it will evidently be found wanting when it is weighed in the proper balances. Our divine Saviour has left us a pattern in this respect which we are required to imitate. He pleased not himself, but though he was rich yet for our sakes he became poor. He did not only empty himself, but he spent himself. The same mind and spirit must be in us, for if we have not the spirit of Christ we are none of his. His disciples had the same spirit, for they left all and followed him, gaining nothing but buffetings, taunts, persecutions, imprisonment and death! The apostle of the gentiles did not only endure all kinds of privations for Christ's sake, but what was gain to him that he counted loss, and his life he counted not dear to himself. The first converts were not only willing to expose their persons to danger and death, but they were ready also to offer up all their substance for the good of others; accordingly they "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need—neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own!" The same spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice is exhibited in the martyrs of all ages. They saw their goods confiscated, they

left their homes and fatherland, and when necessary, as it was in thousands of instances, they counted not their lives dear unto themselves. The same spirit is still required of those who will be Christ's disciples.

If the same spirit now existed would the benevolent operations of the Church be so crippled and feeble; would it be necessary for agents to traverse the land in order to arouse the Church to benevolence with stirring appeals; and would the pulpits and the papers of the different benevolent societies need, as they now do, to occupy the attitude of beggars? Certainly not. The treasures of the Lord, like the widow's barrel of meal and cruise of oil, would be filled silently and steadily, as by unseen hands. If a man is bound to offer up his life, if necessary, for the gospel's sake, it is certainly also his duty to offer up his property in the same way if needed. If a christian is bound to employ his influence and resources of mind for the spread of the gospel, he is certainly also required to dispose of his talent of property in the same way if God has prospered him. Taking it as settled then that the possession of property entails responsibility upon its possessor to use it for God, I will endeavor, in this article to inquire how that responsibility may be discharged most agreeably to the will of God, and so as to secure the greatest amount of blessings to the individual, the church, and the world.

Let me then, my reader, call your attention to the divine direction of Paul: "AS I HAVE GIVEN ORDER TO THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA, EVEN SO DO YE. UPON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK LET EVERY ONE OF YOU LAY BY HIM IN STORE AS GOD HAS PROSPERED HIM, THAT THERE BE NO GATHERINGS WHEN I COME."

Here then we have a divine direction in regard to benevolent contributions, which it is our duty to understand and follow. The spirit of this direction is, that at stated times money shall be "laid by" intended for benevolent purposes. The sum shall be according "as God has prospered" us. If we have been prospered more, then we shall lay by more, and if less, we shall lay by less, but a certain portion shall be regularly given to the Lord. We shall not throw all our income into one purse, and when a call is made upon us, give what we may, at the time, feel able to give, but we shall keep a purse for the Lord, and according as the Lord has prospered shall the Lord have. This portion of the Lord shall be untouched, for it shall be "laid by in store." This plan shall be pursued, not only by the rich, but by all. "Let *every one of you* lay by in store, as God hath

prospered him." That this was a favorite plan of the Apostle is evident from the fact that he gave the same "order to the churches of Galatia" as he did to these christians at Corinth. Let it also be remembered that the Apostle does not only recommend this plan but he gives "order." He was authorized, by the Spirit of inspiration by which he wrote, to lay this upon the churches of Galatia and Corinth as a solemn duty. He gives also the reason why this plan ought to be adopted, it would save the trouble of gathering when he came to receive their contributions.

Let us now attend to some considerations which farther exhibit, illustrate, and enforce this duty.

I. THE ADOPTION OF THIS PLAN IS DUTY.

This can be shown in various ways; and if it can be shown to be duty this ought to be, to a christian, the strongest consideration, and a sufficient one, to induce him immediately to act upon this plan, in his benevolent contributions. Let us see whether it is duty.

1. We have divine order and *precedent* to enjoin and recommend this as a duty. Paul declares that he "gave order" to the churches of Galatia "to adopt this plan; and when he laid the same plan before the church at Corinth he said "so do ye."

We have also a precedent, the result of divine injunction, in the Jewish church. God required of the Jews not only regular contributions, but a certain fixed portion of their income. It is true that the Jewish law of tythes is not binding on us, but still it stands as a precedent to show that God has a right to require a certain regular portion of our income, and that He has, in the past history of the church, exercised that right. The fact that he claimed it of the Jews shows that it was his due, thus it serves at least as a shadow of duty under the new dispensation. In place of the shadow we ought certainly now to expect substance, and the substance ought certainly not to be less, nor less real than the shadow. Then it was duty, but ought not what was then done as duty, yea, and much more, now be done as privilege.

The regular portion which God required of the Jews was heavy. Few christians now give at the same rate; but why should not a christian give as regularly, and as much, because the love of Christ constrains him, as a Jew did, because the law made it his duty? If it was right for God to require so much of the Jews under a dark and imperfect dispensation, has he not a right to expect more from us to whom he has not only "given more," but "better things?" Certainly the attractions and con-

straints of bleeding Calvary ought to have as much power as the directions and terrors of smoking Sinai!—The Jew *must* give regularly a fixed portion; no hard times could excuse him; no coldness of feeling could justify neglect; he must not wait for a zealous impulse produced by a warm appeal; but he must do it regularly, in season and out of season. Now, ought not a christian to give as regularly from principle and privilege, as a Jew did from law and duty?

2. This is duty because the Bible requires that every talent, as soon as received, shall *immediately* be made to yield for the Lord. In the parable of the talents the Lord finds fault with the man who, instead of employing his talent, hid it in the earth, because He had part in the increase, of which He was robbed by the “wicked and slothful servant.” God then, has share in our increase, for which He looks. Not only is a part of our gain the Lord’s, but part of it is His just *as fast* as we gain it, and it ought so fast to be regularly laid by in store for Him, and appropriated to the promotion of His kingdom.

It is certain that every man, to whom God gives wealth, is bound to give according to his wealth. This is granted. Now, if I am worth ten thousand dollars to day, I am accountable for exactly that sum, but if I am worth five hundred more next week, then I am accountable for five hundred more next week, and duty to God demands of me immediately a gift, in exact proportion, to the increase of my wealth. How then have I a right to suffer my property to go on increasing for a whole year, or perhaps more, still retaining God’s part in my stock, and then if an appeal is made, give only as I may then have, or according as I may, at that time, feel able? Is not this keeping back God’s part of the increase, to increase with it my own capital? May not such a servant be accused, if not of wasting, yet of keeping his Lord’s goods!

This point is made still plainer by analogy. In an intellectual and moral point of view, every man is accountable according to his stock of knowledge. Just as fast, therefore, as his knowledge increases does his accountability increase. If he knows more to day than yesterday, then more is required of him to-day than yesterday. So exactly in regard to the talent of wealth. If a man is, at every point of his life, accountable for what he at that time has, it is evident that he cannot suspend or postpone that accountability any more than he can suspend the duties of one day to crowd them upon the next. If there is want, he is in debt to give without waiting for an appeal to warm his heart. Want is always. The poor are always. The heathen are al-

ways! It is then clearly his duty to give *as fast* as he is prospered of the Lord, with increase beyond his necessary wants. Or shall want continue while he holds the means to relieve it?

Here the question may arise, Is it not the duty of a parent to lay up for his children? It might be ultra to deny this claim entirely. Granting him the right to lay up for his children is not, however, granting him the right to lay up for them, that which God requires to be laid by in store for Him. If the question is whether he may lay up all his income for his children, the answer is clearly—no! A certain portion of his increase he is bound to give to the Lord. A reasonable and proper amount beyond doubt, it is right to keep as capital; it might even be proper for him, under certain circumstances, if it is perfectly clear that he could thereby more largely promote the glory of God, to apply part of his extra income to increase his capital. If one of his children is to be educated and started in business, he has no doubt a right to appropriate a portion of his increase to that purpose; but in all this he must conscientiously remember that he is only steward, that his wealth is the Lord's, and that he can not go beyond the *actual* wants of himself and children without encroaching upon the Lord's portion. The Lord's portion of his increase must always be the prominent concern with him, for it would not do to make even the welfare of his children of greater importance than the welfare of Christ's kingdom, for he that loves even his child more than Christ cannot be his disciple.

Several solemn and important considerations ought always to be before the mind of the man who is anxious to lay up wealth for his children. First of all he ought to consider well, that it is connected with great danger. The very knowledge that children have, while yet with their parents, that they are treasuring up an inheritance for them, and the expectation of enjoying it when once it shall fall into their hands, is often the beginning of their ruin. How often is it seen that the children of the rich care neither to acquire the knowledge of some useful business, nor to cultivate their mind in useful knowledge. Professors in the different colleges of the land can testify to the fact, that in nine cases out of ten, the children of the rich are careless students. Almost all our wealthiest men, and those most prosperous in business, have arisen out of obscurity and poverty, without entailed capital. The children of the rich stand in an element of fearful temptation, the power of which, few are found able to withstand! "The most rational, the wisest, the best portion

of mankind, belong to that class who possess "neither poverty nor riches."

Wealth heaped on wealth, nor truth nor safety buys;
The dangers gather as the treasures rise!"

To these facts which observation furnishes of the dangers of wealth may be added the solemn and unerring testimony of the Scriptures. "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition." How true! "The care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word." How true again! "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" Blessed Saviour! how little are thy words regarded by those parents, who do not only themselves love wealth, but are keeping back God's part of their increase, to heap the same soul-destroying curse upon their children! Christian parent! the Saviour says, with holy earnestness, that they that have riches shall hardly be saved, and yet you are laying up in order to place your children in these circumstances, where it will be as easy for a camel to go through the eye of a needle as it will be for them to be saved. Oh! how cruel to your children are your tender mercies!

Again: parents who are laying up for their children ought seriously to ponder the fact that these children may not be proper stewards to receive their wealth in trust. The parent is not sure that his children will be disposed to use the wealth which they inherit from the Lord; on the contrary, there is a strong probability that the Lord may be less remembered in it by them than he was by the parent while it was still in his hands. If this is foreseen by Providence the parent will either not succeed in transmitting it into their hands, or if he does, it will not long remain there. The eye of God is on it, for it is his, and it must promote his glory. The father is opposing Providence, or at least he fails to see his will, in hoarding it for them, but God will succeed, in spite of his caution, prudence, or dulness, to get it into the hands of proper stewards. To effect this He may perhaps even find it necessary to make the wrath of man to praise Him! Thus—the children, by the very means of entailed wealth, may become high minded, profligate and wicked, as has a thousand times been the case, and it will soon be squandered; but while it is squandering the hand of God is on it. To the parent who lays by the Lord's part of the increase, and the children who are first made profligate by it and then squander it, the words of the wise man have a fearful application: "A

man's heart deviseth his way : but the Lord directeth his steps." (Prov. xvi : 9) The parent may "devise" and plan the circumstances into which he intends to place his children, and to this end he may at death by will entail that upon them which in life he should have laid by him in store for the Lord, but God has a "*will*" too! "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand!" It is not a man's will, or any thing that his will can entail, that can make his children rich. "The Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich." (1 Sam. ii : 7) Let no one expect to make his children rich, by hoarding for them the Lord's part of the increase. Experience shows abundantly that very often it does not remain with them, and when it does, it is to them a curse instead of a blessing. That ill-gotten wealth—and that which is kept back from the Lord is certainly ill-gotten—does not pass to the third generation, has long ago become a common proverb.

3. This duty will become farther clear, when we consider every christian as a *steward* for God. So he is represented in the Bible. A steward is one who superintends the business and property of another. He does not own the property over which he presides, he has only that which is allowed him of the owner. He has evidently no right whatever to hoard up, or appropriate to himself the income; but as fast as it comes in, it is his for whom he is steward. God is the householder, for whom all men are stewards. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. We have our living, and he has the increase. What we need he kindly grants us as our wages, but what we do not need is not ours, and we must not keep it back, for "will a man rob God!"

It is required of a steward that he be found faithful, not only in presiding over the property of his master, but in regularly presenting him with the increase of his stewardship; but could a steward be considered faithful who would hoard up, or apply to his own use, the regular income, and give to his master such portions, and at such times, as he felt disposed, without any regularity. Yet this is the common way in which God is served by his stewards. Let such beware lest God take from them the stewardship, and pronounce them with righteous indignation wicked, slothful and unprofitable servants.

II. Even if it could not be shown from positive injunction to be duty, still if the plan is IN ITSELF INNOCENT and involves no violation of clear duty, and can be shown to be a wise plan to do good, we would be bound to adopt it. We are to be wise as serpents to do good, provided only that our wise plans are at

the same time harmless as the dove. God finds fault with the children of light, because they are not as wise in their generation to lay plans as the children of this world. God has endowed us with wisdom, that we may be wise to win souls and to do good. That this plan is innocent, is evident from the fact that the Apostle Paul recommends it, and ordered the churches of Galatia and Corinth to adopt it. That point then is settled. Now it only remains to show that it is wise to do good, and adapted to the end which benevolence seeks to reach.

This is a wise plan, because in this way any christian is enabled to give more, and feel it less, than if he give only from impulse produced by direct appeals. The man who pays a few cents each day for tobacco considers it as nothing, he scarcely feels the amount, but what a considerable sum does the aggregate make at the year's end. Families send a few cents, here and there, to shops and stores daily, for small articles, and they do not feel that it is of any consequence, but if an account were kept they would be astonished how it would run up in a year. So if a man will lay by him in store, but a small part of his income when he receives it, he would not much miss the amount, and yet at the end of the year he would find with joy that it far overran what he was enabled ordinarily to give by irregular impulse.

The plan would also have a tendency to check useless squandering of money among professing christians. To squander our income is just as much misapplying it, as it is to hoard it. This is at the present day a crying sin among professing christians. How much of what may be denominated "loose change" is wantonly spent on luxuries, to satisfy appetites that are self-created, and that grow only more hungry by being fed. If this plan were adopted, there would at every presenting temptation of this kind be a conflict excited in the mind. The question would be, whether a foolish appetite or religious benevolence has the strongest claims upon a christian's loose change. Thus habits of self-denial would gradually be formed, which is one of the first, the plainest, and most important duties of one who would follow Jesus. For this there is great need; for where is the spirit of self-denial? Do most of our wealthy christians deny themselves of any thing? Do they not procure all that their hearts can wish in the way of personal luxury and domestic convenience and comfort?—yea, and much is found both upon their persons, and in their dwellings, that is not even a convenience, but rather a burden and a care! But if a treasury of the Lord were thus kept open, would not conscience sometimes insist upon retrench-

ments and self-denials, and direct into the treasury what otherwise finds its way into the great world-market, where all the little self-created and imaginary wants of men are supplied?

By this plan too, the treasuries of the church would be regularly and steadily replenished, and her operations would not be so fluctuating and uncertain. The expense of employing agents, and the unpleasant business of continual solicitation on the part of ministers and religious papers, would all be set aside. A fountain of benevolent resources would be opened up, the stream of which, like the waters of Shiloah, would go softly, but the heritage of God would smile in its course, and this desolate world of wants and woes, would be like a garden which the Lord doth water.

The benefits of this plan of regular contributions can be still more fully seen, when we look at the operations of the same mode, in substance, as it is employed in the state to replenish its resources. In the state, every individual is required to give regularly a certain sum according to his income. And what efficiency is here seen! What resources are at hand! What astonishing aggregates are raised! Its capitals are built, its national councils are supported at heavy expense; its officers are richly paid; its internal improvements are energetically carried forward; armories are built; navies are supplied with ships at great expense; wars are carried on, at the expense of millions on millions; penitentiaries, prisons, almshouses and asylums are erected, and a thousand nameless expenses are met, and yet plentiful resources are always at hand! Now, if the love of country will induce men to submit to such taxation, ought not the love of Christ and of souls have an effect still stronger. If the benefits of having a well-supported government are enough to recompense men to make such contributions, ought not the desire to have the enterprises of the church efficiently carried forward be stronger still; and if the amount is so easily gotten by regular contributions, why ought not the children of light, in this respect, be as wise as the children of this world? The church stands under heavier responsibilities, and has higher hopes to inspire to duty, and yet in the spirit of enterprise, she falls far short of the state! What is wrong? Has not the church forgotten the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich?

III. All ANALOGY proclaims the wisdom of this plan of regular benevolence, and is loud in urging to its adoption, both as a blessing to himself and to those whom he wishes to benefit by

his gifts. A spring that has a regular outlet has the purest and the healthiest water. A tree that is regularly pruned will be itself most flourishing and bear the best fruit. Machinery that is regularly and temperately used will be better, work better, need less repair, and require less expense, than that which is often stopped for a time only to run faster when it is started again. The physical system of man is healthiest and most efficient, when its energies are regularly replenished with nourishment and moved by exercise. Irregular and intemperate exercise or food are alike injurious to the body and the mind. The strength of the black-smith's arm is increased, not by laying up and saving its strength, but by a regular application of it. So it is in nature, and so it is also in grace. Rust is the consequence of hoarding silver and gold, and just so, rust and stagnation of spirit is the consequence of hoarding the resources of benevolence with which God has blest us. Coin is kept bright by being used, and it is just so with our benevolent affections. The intellectual well-being of the mind depends upon its stores being regularly put to use. By communicating regularly to others, our own stock of knowledge is increased. To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance, from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath.

Under this view, those paradoxical passages in Proverbs have a strong and beautiful meaning. "There is that maketh himself rich, yet hath nothing: there is that maketh himself poor, yet hath great riches" (13: 7). "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat; and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." (11: 24-26) This also explains "the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The requirement which God made of the Jews to give regularly a fixed portion of their increase, was founded upon this principle—that regular giving is good for the giver. He required regular gifts of the Jews, not because He had absolute need of them, but because He knew it would have a good influence on them. The law ceremonial as well as moral, was disciplinary a schoolmaster to correct them, and to prepare them for coming blessings. Nothing can be plainer than that all God's requirements were designed for their good. His laws are laid in wisdom, and in complete adaptation to the nature and wants of man. He knew that requiring a certain regular portion of their increase, would restrain them from cultivating too strong a desire for gain, and make them feel at the same time that what

they had was only lent. Why should it not be so still? It is so. God could carry on the triumphs of his cross without the regular contributions of his people, but He makes this demand of them in love; to kill the aspirations of avarice, and to keep the benevolent fountains of the heart regularly and constantly open.

While this plan of regular giving is thus intended and adapted to bless the giver himself, it is no less adapted to bless those who share his regular contributions. It is a great advantage to the different enterprises of the church to have regular sources of supplies; and whenever these sources are irregular and spasmodic, more or less injury is sustained. The laws of life, in a healthy state, are always regular; whenever any action of an abrupt and phenomenal character presents itself, it is always a sign of derangement. So also in the law of the life of grace—for grace too is life, and is unfolded best according to the regular operations of life. The season in which the earth is blest with regular night-dews, and temperate but frequent showers, will always be more fruitful than a season of heavy deluging rains and intervening drought.

IV. One that gives regularly according to this plan gives from PRINCIPLE and a SENSE OF DUTY, and not from mere impulse of feeling. Those acts are always more valuable to the subject himself and to the world, which rest upon steady principle, than those which are the result of a momentary and abrupt impulse of excitement. A person, for instance, may attend a missionary meeting, where the forlorn case of the heathen is exhibited in glowing eloquence, and if he is a person of peculiar warmth of temperament he may be induced to give or pledge himself for a sum, which in his calm moments he will see was not in proportion to his means. He will therefore have to condemn his conduct, which is very injurious to his benevolent feelings. It is a true moral evil, when the feelings are thus made to be, or suffered to become, a trap for judgment, reason, and conscience. It is required of man to give *according* to his ability, and not *beyond* it; if he goes beyond his means he errs and sins as much as if he does not come up to them. That is the most acceptable gift—and indeed the only one truly acceptable—which is in exact proportion to the increase with which God has prospered us. A man's income may allow him to give a certain sum each year, where circumstances at the time when an appeal is made to him, would not allow him to give as much. This difficulty too, is prevented if he lays it down as a principle of duty to give a certain fixed and regular portion of his income,

and then conscientiously lays it by in store for the Lord. Religious benevolence at the present day lacks that steadiness which is instant in season and out of season, and the great cause is that our mode of making benevolent contributions rests on impulse and not on steady principle.

If giving were done from principle, the motive would not so often be wrong. There would be less of alms-giving before men, and less temptation to do it to be seen of men. It would destroy also the unholy system of rivalry in giving, so often resorted to in public collections. It would keep before the mind a continual conviction of duty, as well as a delightful sense of privilege. Thus the exercise of the benevolent affections being regular and unobtrusive, would have about them more of that loveliness, which while it blesses seeks its reward from the consciousness of having done a good deed, rather than from the praise of men. Thus silently but refreshing, like the dew, would gifts fall into the habitations of want. The blessing clearly seen, the cause of it secret! Like in meadows are often seen—

“rills that slip

In matted grass, that with a livelier green
Betrays the secret of their silent course.”

The bruised reed would be bound up by an unseen hand, and the smoking flax be fanned into a flame by a secret breath. In the lonely dwellings of want and woe, there would be joy and singing, where no trumpet of a passing benefactor was ever heard. What a lovely imitation would we thus have of the benevolence of Him who, scattered blessings in His way wherever He went, and yet did not cry nor lift up His voice in the street!

V. The man who adopts this plan, can PURSUE HIS BUSINESS WITH ZEAL, and yet WITH A GOOD CONSCIENCE. One who pursues his business merely for gain, must have, at times, more or less distress of conscience. There must ever be something of reproach before a man who toils for hoarding. It is impossible that it should not at times seem even to him a little business; but when a man adopts this plan, he can be diligent in the pursuit of increase, and yet he can do all literally, and with the sweetest propriety, to the glory of God. A high and holy object will be before him at every stroke of the hammer, and at every profitable purchase or sale. What he wins thus, by lawful economy, is so much won out of the world to be now certainly devoted to God.

He would labor also with a recompense of great reward before

him, which can inspire him to diligence in business, as no other motive can inspire. He who labors, knowing that the fruit of his toils must end at farthest in the grave, labors under cold encouragement. Not so he who knows that his works will follow him with their blessed consequences beyond this life. On the labors of such a man, too, rest the smiles of God; he need not fear that a curse is slumbering in his basket and store, to wake at some time with fearful fury upon him or his children. He honors the Lord with his substance and with the *first-fruits* of ALL his *increase*—mark the language, it plainly implies that he is to give regularly to the Lord as he is prospered—so shall his barns be filled with plenty (Prov. iii: 9–10). Besides all this the idea of being a regular fountain of supplies to some post of want in God's kingdom, can stimulate and sweeten toil, and bless the heart with a reward, which far surpasses any worldly luxury.

VI. Without adopting this plan it is impossible to escape the SIN OF HOARDING, which is so severely forbidden in the sacred scriptures. The rust of the treasures of such as hoard, shall be a witness against them in the last days.

We have already seen that as fast as a man's wealth increases, so fast a part is due to God, and ought *immediately* to be laid by in store for Him. If this is retained, it shows dishonesty towards God, an inordinate love of gain, a callous heart in regard to the wants of others, a want of trust in the providence of God for the future, against the wants of which he seeks to prepare by the wicked prudence of hoarding. This all is wicked, and God will punish it. Especially does He love an implicit trust in Him. It is reasonable to expect that His disapprobation must rest on him, who endeavors by hoarding to secure himself against future want, instead of trusting God and taking no thought for to-morrow. How foolishly wicked is it, to burden the present with the cares of the future, and to seek to secure supplies for us and our children against coming days, when we know not whether any of us shall live to see them! Has not the Saviour said, Sufficient to each day is the evil thereof; why then crowd future cares which may never come, upon the present, which has cares and evils sufficient of its own.

That God is displeased with such faithless people is shown, not only by scripture, but by observation and experience. Losses which persons often sustain prove that God is displeased with the use they make of their property. God's hand is in these losses; He takes from them a part of their property, because they did not make a proper use of it. Losses may be correctly defined *God laying His hand upon dead capital*. That God who

numbers the hairs of our head, and causes one to fall when there are too many, presides also over all our property, and takes that part of it away which is not in proper use.

God exercises over wealth, as over all other resources, a particular providence, and directs it to the place where it will do the most good. Whenever, therefore He sees dead stock hoarded, which the holder as steward will not be prevailed upon to put to usury, He directs His providence to turn it into another channel. Thus the one talent which the wicked and slothful servant had hid in the earth, was directed to be taken from him and given to the one who had five talents, because there it would be in hands that had proved themselves worthy of such a trust. To him that hath, and is faithful over it, shall be given that which is taken, by the providence of God, from him that had, but was not diligent to increase it. This taking away is done in various ways; often by breaks and failures, by which wealth is made to change hands, until it gets into the hands of a good steward. "The wealth of the wicked is laid up for the just" (Prov. 13 : 22). It may thus even be taken out of their hands by wicked persons, and by dishonest means, but God presides over it, and while He punishes the wicked who do it, He makes their wrath to praise him.

"From seeming evil still educing good."

An instance will illustrate this. A man in one of the middle counties of Pennsylvania owned a farm, and four thousand dollars besides, which he had loaned out. He was miserly, for although he had no heirs, yet he gave nothing to benevolent purposes. He was at one time called upon by a person who was collecting money to liquidate a debt on a church, which had been erected in one of the villages in the county. He gave nothing. A short time after the man to whom he had lent the four thousand dollars failed, and all was gone! Was this chance? There was in the same county a man who was quite benevolent. He was in the habit of giving all he could give of his increase, to the Lord. He had for a long time eight hundred dollars in the same man's hands, by whose failure the other man lost four thousand. This was not dead stock, for the Lord received his portion of the increase. The failure was quite unexpected to all, yet strange to tell, several months before it took place, these eight hundred dollars, without any design on his part, without any suspicion of the break, and by a peculiar train of circumstances, were transferred into other hands and were safe. Was this chance? No! If we could see the secret history of providences, we could no doubt find many similar cases.

When Abraham journeyed from Chaldea to Canaan, he took all his substance with him, and he was "very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold;" and though he travelled among the Canaanites and Perizzites, yet his property was safely preserved. May not the reason be sought in the fact, afterwards mentioned, that he gave tythes of all that he had, and refused to take even a thread or a shoe-latchet which was not justly his own. Lot, who sought so ardently for wealth, and who settled in the wicked city of Sodom from pecuniary considerations, was robbed of all he had by some marauding chiefs who invaded the land, and would perhaps never have regained it, had it not been that Abraham interfered, who pursued the robbers, and brought back the goods of Lot, his brother's son!

We have seen how the providence of God, makes wealth, which is dead stock, change hands; but this is not the only way by which He takes it out of their hands. If dead stock is in the hands of any of God's people, and He sees that it hardens their hearts, as such wealth always does, He may, instead of passing it into other hands, permit it to be entirely destroyed. This may be done by flood or fire, by blight upon the field or pestilence among the cattle, and in various other ways, which are called by the thoughtless and faithless world accidents or misfortunes. If a man loses any property, in such a way that it is entirely destroyed, and is afterwards of no use to any one, as when a horse dies, barn burns, or ship sinks, it may be called *God demolishing men's idols!* For "shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it." This is God's mode of taking reprisals of them that have robbed him, or kept back his part of the increase. In this way the miserly savings of years, often go in a moment. Riches literally take unto themselves wings, and fly away as an eagle towards heaven;—they take the direction of the voice which called them out of the hands of their unfaithful possessors! Let any man take a correct account of the losses of this kind, which he sustains in a year, and he will find that it is as large a tax, as if he laid by him in store regularly a considerable portion of his increase for God.

In conclusion, let me urge you, by keeping your heart and hands open in regular benevolence, to secure yourself against the hardening power of wealth. Still water will gradually and silently gather a sediment in the bottom, by which the whole will be made stagnant and foul. Be alarmed, for your soul is in danger! Not in vain did the Saviour say, how hardly shall they that have riches be saved. Not in vain did Solomon say, "Labor not to be rich!" With what lonely regret, and with what

deep significance, does Paul say, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world!" Lord save thy people from the "deceitfulness of riches!"

It is often said that riches harden the heart, but the declaration proves only a powerless cant phrase, unless we look at the reason why it hardens, and at the process by which this hardening is carried on. Yet it is plain on close reflection. The possession of wealth has a tendency to excite in the mind of its possessor a spirit of independence, which will soon degenerate into self-reliance and pride. It places him in a position where he may to some extent lord it over others; he is apt to feel that, in his circumstances, he stands over and above others, and this is something which the natural man, and even in the christian the remains of the natural man, loves. Here then it has a direct tendency to cultivate a spirit in direct opposition to the christian spirit—independence, self-reliance, and pride. Thus, a man as he increases in wealth is apt to lose gradually that sweet humility, that delightful sense of direct dependence upon God's providential care, and that daily implicit trust in Him from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, which so much endears to the heart a kind heavenly Father. The man comparatively poor sits daily with childlike dependence at his father's table, and receives his bread directly from His hand, while the rich man eats in the house of a steward, getting all his mercies second-handed. From this sweet filial feeling every accession of wealth is a cold remove.

More evident still is the fact, that as wealth increases, cares also increase to the possessor. His attention is called to different points often at the same time. His business becomes more and more complex and intricate. At one point his property is exposed to loss in unfaithful hands; at another by the ebb of trade; at another, part of his stock is going to waste for want of attention; at another still, there is dead stock for want of moving. He has, it is true, his stewards, foremen, and clerks; but men are selfish and often unfaithful, so that he must still have an eye over all. Thus his spirit is divided, restless, and absorbed. In the evening, when he would give his last thoughts to God, the vexations of the day come plodding home *in mass* to be the companions of his fireside, and to haunt his pillow. At night "dreams come through the multitude of business," and his restless spirit enjoys not even in sleep a respite from care. In the morning, when he would send his first thoughts out to God, they are soon entangled in the webs of business, which are in a moment spun around him. He rises a slave!—to be held

again, under the task not of one but of many masters! Gradually the cultivation of his heart is neglected entirely, or made a secondary matter; his office of priest in the family is either laid aside or attended to in a cold, hasty, and distracted manner. In short, the spirit of the world has invaded first his own heart, then his closet, and last but worst of all, the sacred retirement of the family circle, where his children are bound in the spirit of gain to be offered as willing victims on the altar of Mammon.

Let the consequences be pondered. Oh that the following sentence, and the sentiment, true as God himself, which it contains, were written upon the heart of every rich man's heart, in letters of more fearful fire than those which once recorded Belshazzar's doom upon his palace walls:

THE MORE WEALTH A MAN GETS, THE MORE ARE HIS RESPONSIBILITIES INCREASED: THE MORE WEALTH A MAN GETS, THE LESS DOES HE BECOME QUALIFIED AND DISPOSED TO DISCHARGE THESE RESPONSIBILITIES!

Terrible and alarming condition! Who then, that is rich can be saved? Is there no remedy. None, except that which will keep us from getting unduly rich. Is it asked how this can be done? We answer, *as your wealth increases, so let the Lord's portion increase*, which you regularly lay by in store for Him.

Lancaster.

H. H.

PROGRESS IN THE ART OF TRANSLATING.

IN one thing I am constrained to acknowledge that some of the poets of the present age surpass any that have gone before them. They are decidedly better hands at translating. In original poetry, no doubt, they often fall short of their predecessors, but in the art of bringing over the thoughts of others into their own languages they are certainly better skilled. In works translated by earlier poets we are not often permitted to come into immediate contact with the old authors themselves. In being renovated and dressed off in a new language, of many of their old fashioned traits with their old costumes they have been unfortunately divested. The translators of ancient poems, to adapt them better to the tastes of their times and countries could not help transfusing into them a good deal of their own national modes of thought, to the exclusion of what they deemed all too foreign and barbaric. Thus their own mental and moral

features show themselves often more prominent than those of the original composers. In this respect, however, some of our more modern poets have succeeded better. They have endeavored to enter more fully into the feelings and conditions of their authors and their times, and to bring them over into their respective languages as little injured as possible. As yet in this art, I admit, they have not arrived at perfection. Of their intermediate faces we may still catch some occasional glimpses; but from their present advancement I cannot help fancying that ere long the day will come when these will be made wholly invisible; when literary feasts from foreign lands will be spread before us, their bestowers, all the while remaining, like good fairies, unseen; when the choicest grapes from other climes will be presented to us not dried nor candied but fresh and blooming as when taken from the vines.

"A lad in the choice of his words and in the style of his sentences," saith the late Dr. Arnold in an Article on the Use of the Classics, "should be taught to follow the analogy required by the age and character of the writer whom he is translating. For instance, in translating Homer, hardly any words should be employed except Saxon and the oldest and simplest of those which are of French origin; and the language should consist of a series of simple propositions connected with one another only by the most inartificial conjunctions. In translating the tragedians the words should be principally Saxon but mixed with many of French or foreign origin, like the language of Shakspeare and the other dramatists of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I."

Such sentiments show an advancement in our day in the art of translating. To the learned writers in the first half of the eighteenth century how proposterous would they have sounded! The language of their own times they regarded as the standard of perfection to which all ancient writings of worth should properly be reduced; and they translated into it even many of their older native poets. Their highly polished verses they conformed to rule as exactly as did some of the gardeners of those days their clipped hedges and shrubbery, and their euphony and grandeur they attempted, especially about the middle of this century, to improve by the employment of many ornate words introduced immediately from the Latin and Greek without having received them, in the old round-about way, through the Norman French. Notwithstanding all their pains, however, their age is now regarded as being the most unpoetical in the history of English literature. By means of the good old Saxon employed

in our present version of the Old Testament, which providentially was rendered into English not later than the age of James the First, how admirably the simple manners of the patriarchs are described ! How touchingly the stories of Isaac and Rebekah, of Joseph and his brethren, of Naomi and Ruth, for instance, are set forth and how much would they lose in vividness and pathos by being told in more modern English ! What sublimity is retained in the Psalms and most of the Prophets thus rendered ! The heroic times of ancient Greece in spirit and manners correspond, in a great measure, to the patriarchal times of the Old Testament. Of course then the works that describe these, in being translated into English, should by all means be set forth, whether in prose or verse, in the same unsophisticated mode of speech. The simple majesty of the Iliad, however, so well exhibited by Homer in his olden dialect, is almost entirely obscured, it is well known, in the translation of it by Pope. Every thing there is brought too far forward into the refined times of civilization. Of the old heroes the noble simplicity which distinguished them is in a great measure done away with by their being made to express themselves in the polished language of the modern drawing-room. Those fine comparisons too, in which Homer abounds, drawn immediately from nature, Pope must needs be trying to improve by a few superadded touches of his own and art's. He must be endeavoring to set them off more splendidly, to be sure, by throwing in some colors not to be found in the original but of his own superior mixing. While burnishing them up, however, and heightening, in this way, their beauties, as he fancies, how often, alas ! doth he obliterate in them what, in the original constitutes, their highest charm, their truthfulness to outward nature !¹

¹ As a striking specimen of this, his *improved* translation of Homer's admired moonlight scene, in the eighth book of the Iliad, has been often quoted :

“ As when the moon, refulgent lamp of night !
 O'er heaven's clear azure spreads her sacred light,
 When not a breath disturbs the deep serene,
 And not a cloud o'ercasts the solemn scene ;
 Around her throne the vivid planets roll,
 And stars unnumbered gild the glowing pole,
 O'er the dark trees a yellower verdure shed
 And tip with silver every mountain's head ;
 Then shine the vales, the rocks in prospect rise,
 A flood of glory bursts from all the skies ;
 The conscious swains rejoicing in the sight,
 Eye the blue vault and bless the useful light.”

But though the writers in the reigns of Elizabeth and James the First were mostly happier in their language than their successors in the reign of Anne and those afterwards, I would by no means wish to assert that as translators they surpassed them in all other respects. Into appropriate English prose for turning some of the old classic authors, on account of their congenial simplicity, they were certainly well qualified, but most of them, it must be said, fell short when they attempted versification. They had not yet discovered the most suitable rhythms into which the respective measures of the old poets could be best converted. Chapman, for instance, in his translation of Homer, instead of using ten-syllabled blank verse, which himself and other cotemporary dramatists have properly done in their plays, unfortunately adopted a line of fourteen syllables, supposing, with many others in his day, that this constituted the true English heroic. Susceptible it is, to be sure, of great simplicity and pathos, being in fact the old English ballad line unbroken into two; but it cannot receive into English any thing like the full grandeur of the Grecian Epos as exhibited in hexameter. His verse being longer than Homer's required a filling up on his part, which encouraged, it is likely, his disposition towards expansion, frequently carried out into whole lines of his own; while, on the other hand, to keep his book in compass, no doubt, he has just as often retrenched with as free a hand. Thus not so much a literal translation has he given us as an extended paraphrase. Striving after the sublimity of his author too, of which his measure was not fully susceptible, he was sometimes borne aloft into something like rant and fustian. Still being gifted with a truly epic genius, his work is racy and spirited throughout, having about it all the rich flavor of antiquity; the genuine smack of an old wine; partaking not so much, however, of the Pramnian of Homer as of the good old brown stout—*κρίθινος κύρος*—of English brewing.

"I knew there was a style somewhere," says Cowper in one

"Here," says Southey, "are the planets rolling round the moon; here is the pole gilt and glowing with stars; here are trees made yellow and mountains tipped with silver by the moonlight; and here is the whole sky in a flood of glory; appearances not to be found either in Homer or in nature; finally these gilt and glowing skies, at the very time when they are thus pouring forth a flood of glory, are represented as a blue vault! The astronomy in these lines would not appear more extraordinary to Dr. Herschell than the imagery to every person who has observed a moonlight scene."—*Quart. Rev.* Vol. xii, page 87.

of his letters to Lady Hesketh, March 22, 1790, "could I but find it, in which Homer ought to be rendered, and which alone would suit him. Long time I blundered about it, ere I could attain to any decided judgment on the matter; at first, I was betrayed by a desire of accommodating my language to the simplicity of his into much of the quaintness that belonged to our writers of the fifteenth century. In the course of many revisals I have delivered myself from this evil, I believe, entirely; but I have done it slowly, as a man separates himself from his mistress when he is going to marry. I had so strong a predilection in favor of this style at first, that I was crazed to find that others were not as much enamoured with it as myself. At every passage of that sort which I obliterated, I groaned bitterly, and said to myself, I am spoiling my work to please those who have no taste for the simple graces of antiquity. But in measure as I adopted a more modern phraseology, I became a convert to their opinion, and in the last revisal, which I am now making, am not sensible of having spared a single expression of the obsolete kind. I see my work so much improved by the alteration, that I am filled with wonder at my own backwardness to assent to the necessity of it, and the more when I consider that Milton, with whose manner I account myself intimately acquainted, is never quaint, never twangs through the nose, but is every where grand and elegant, without resorting to musty antiquity for his beauties. On the contrary, he took a long stride forward, left the language of his own day far behind him, and anticipated the expressions of a century yet to come."

Dear, sensitive, tasteful Cowper! Apart, in a great measure, from thy cotemporaries, and obeying merely the dictates of thine own better judgment, a long stride forward thou didst thyself make in the paths of literature. Not having the fear of Dr. Johnson before thine eyes, thou didst dare to revive blank verse, and to treat of religious subjects in thy poems. With the ornate style of many of the writers of thy day, as it seemed to mystify their thoughts, thou wast not well pleased. To set forth, therefore, in fairer light, thine own imaginings, thou didst seek after a plainer and simpler style, regarding perspicuity of greater worth than even smoothness or polish. Still, by the prevailing vitiated taste around thee, as we see above, thy better judgment was sometimes partly over-ruled. 'To accommodate thy language to the simplicity of Homer, it was not required of thee, sweet bard, that thou should'st have revived again the "aureate terms," the redundant ornaments and anglicized Latin words too much employed, we confess, even by the writers of the fifteenth

century : but couldst not thou have culled out a little more of their Saxon ? Couldst not thou, at any rate, coming down to later times, have drawn forth more plentifully than thou hast done from the strong Old English, so much in vogue during the age of Elisabeth ? More modern bards, taking from thee their cue, have proceeded further in this matter. Catching inspiration from the study of the old English authors, they have been borne not backwards but forward. They have been led in this way to use, even more than thou, a simpler style of writing ; to employ less transposition in their sentences ; to set forth their meaning rather through words of Saxon origin, or the oldest and simplest of the French, than through those of later introduction ; whereby their poetry hath certainly been very much heightened and improved.

Though several translations of Homer, I believe, have been made in the present century, I have not yet had the privilege of reading any one of these in full ; but, on account of the improved state of our poetic language, I cannot help thinking that, faithful and simple as the version of Cowper is, yet a poet, even of inferior abilities, might now be able to give us a better. By imitating the simpler and more Saxon blank verse of Wordsworth, Southey or Tennyson, he would bring over more fully the true spirit of the original. Some specimens I have seen of a translation of the *Iliad* by Southey, which were fully as simple and literal, I think, as Cowper's, and certainly more smooth and harmonious. Saxon words, it is often supposed, being mostly one-syllabled, are not the best suited for rendering into English the long compounded epithets in which Homer abounds ; but any one, on consulting Tennyson, or any of our best latest poets, will discover this to be a mistake. He will find, from the many specimens that will there meet him on every page, not only that the Saxon is capable of being formed into long and suitable compounds, but that these are, generally speaking, the most striking and picturesque in our language. By the general reader their etymologies are more easily understood, and being mostly concrete and not abstract in their meanings, they make on the senses more vivid impressions. Of this even Chapman was fully aware in his day ; and the beautiful formations of this sort which he has introduced into his Homer are ornaments not only to his translation but to the English language itself.

I confess that I have a small liking for English hexameter, notwithstanding its decided anti-Saxon spirit and strong Romanizing tendency. On its first introduction into our language, at

the close of the sixteenth century, it was, we know, by the best writers of the day, indignantly denounced and ridiculed; while, at the same time, by its friends and admirers, it was just as warmly praised and stoutly upheld. "If I never deserve any better remembrance," exclaimeth Gabriel Harvey, the friend of Spencer, in one of his *Four Letters*, "let me be epitaphed the *Invention of the English Hexameter!* whome learned Mr. Stanihurst imitated in his *Virgill*, and excellent Sir P. Sidney disdained not to follow in his *Arcadia* and elsewhere." Thomas Nashe, on the other hand, in his *Apology of Pierce Pennilesse*, observes that "Stanihurst, the otherwise learned, trod a foul, lumbring, boisterous, wallowing measure, in his translation of *Virgil*.—He had never been praised by Gabriel Harvey for his labor, if therein he had not been so famously absurd." As a specimen of this translation let us hear the first four lines of the second book of the *Æneid*:

" With tentative listning each wight was settled in harkning;
Then father *Æneas* chronicled from loftie bed bautie:
You bid me, O princesse, to scarifie a festerd old sore,
How that the Troians were prest by the Grecian armie."

We own that had this invention come into general use at that time, to the exclusion of all rhyme, as its patrons most ardently desired, no longer pure English would the language of poetry have remained, but into dog-latin or, to use one of their own classical phrases, "*Thrasonical huffe-snuffe*," it would have degenerated. Notwithstanding all this, however, after having slept for full two centuries, by some of our best poets it has, of late, been revived, and it seems to me with better success. In the course of years our language having become more pliable and smooth, if not more vigorous, it can now be woven into compositions of finer texture, and accommodated better to foreign rhythms. A translator, who retains the measure of his author, will be able, of course, to make his version more literal, and, especially if possessed of proper sympathies and talent, to bear with it also more of the freshness and spirit of the original. Still, the hexameter being measured properly not by accent but by quantity, it must be admitted, is wholly unenglish in its constitution. Our poetry can never be made to walk in it, as naturally and with the same stately steppings, as doth the Latin or Greek. Pursuing this rhythm the English bard, instead of arriving at the true sublimity of his author, is more likely, in his fury, to be driven aside into the mock-heroic or bombast. To the height of the "*bird of the Maconian song*," at any rate, in

VOL. III.—NO. I.

this style, his pegasus, however skillfully urged, can never attain. At the announcement then, which has been lately made, that an edition of the *Iliad*, rendered into free and flowing English hexameters, is likely soon to be added to our Homeric library, I must confess that I am not filled with the brightest anticipations. If employed at all, we think this measure best adapted to receive into English only some of the shorter pieces of the old Greek or Latin poets that aspire to no great loftiness of sentiment. Here, with the rhythm should the mock heroic or the ludicrous occasionally creep in, it is not always entirely out of place. For a specimen let us try our hand on the twentieth Idyl of Theocritus :

Euneicá at me laughed when I wished with a kiss to salute her,
And me tauntingly thus she addressed : Get away with a plaguet'ye!
Being a herdsman you think me to kiss, you wretch ! I have not
learned

Rustic-like to salute ; the lips that I press must be town-bred.
Never may you my beautiful mouth kiss—not in your dreams, sir !
How you stare ! what a language you speak ! how rudely you trifle!—
Oh, to be sure, you're a fine spoken man ; you can use the genteel
phrase ;

What most exquisite down on your chin ! How lovely your hair is!—
Bah! keep aloof ; your lips are diseased ; your hands are the darkest,
And how badly you smell ! Get away from me ! Do not pollute me.

Thus while she spoke, three times, to preserve her, she spat in
her bosom ;

And me down from the head to the feet she continued surveying.
Pouching her lips, she disdainfully snuffed, and she looked at me
sideways.

Still, woman-like, her charms she set off with her airs ; half her
teeth shown,

Proudly she laughed me to scorn ; whereupon for me did the blood
boil ;

And from pain my cheeks grew red, like a rose with the dew wet.
Off she departed, me leaving : chagrin I still in my heart bear,
That me, the graceful, this naughty coquette with her speech did
malign thus.

Shepherds, tell me the truth as it is ; whether beautiful am I ?
Hath any god me suddenly formed into some other mortal ?
Certainly me hitherto did grace some freshness of beauty,
As doth the ivy its tree, and it covered in clusters my dark chin.
Ringlets were mine, my temples around, like parsley, adorning ;
And my forehead above shone fair, set off by my black brows.
Eyes too I had more piercingly grey than the glaucous Athena's.
My mouth sweeter than cream-cheese was ; and forth from my ripe
lips,

Flowed for me a voice more sweet than the drippings of honey.
 Rich is for me the melody too when my Pan's-pipe I play on,
 Or when with clarionet I discourse, or with reed, or with cross-flute.
 And all the fair me beautiful name in the shades of the mountain ;
 And all the fair me love ; yet this city-maiden did not love.
 But because I'm a herdsman she fled me. Never she hath heard,
 How Dionysos, the beautiful, drove his calves through the vallies ;
 Never hath known how Cypris herself was betrothed to a herdsman ;
 Flocks on the hills did her Phrygian tend ; her Adonis himself too
 In the deep forests she loved and in the deep forests lamented.
 Endymion, who was he ? Not a herdsman ? whom surely Selena,
 Tending his herds did love ; and down from Olympus descending,
 Into the Latmian vale she came, and reposed by her choice one.
 Thou too, Rhea, dost weep for thy swain ; and didst not thou also,
 O Saturn's son, in quest of thy boy, cattle-feeding, a bird roan ?
 But Euneica alone, forsooth, her herdsman did not love !
 Better than Cybela she, and than Cypris, and she than Selena !
 No more thus thou, Cypris, thy darling no more in the city
 Nor in the mountain shouldst love, but alone through the night thou
 shouldst slumber.

What a pity it is that into the Scottish dialect the *Idyls* of Theocritus may not properly be translated, since it is so well suited for pastoral poetry and so capable of expressing the broad simplicity of the Doric. Unfortunately, however, it is altogether local in its use. Translated into this idiom the scenes of Theocritus would no longer be laid in Sicily but in Scotland. Polyphemus would appear entirely out of place amid the cleughs and scaurs of Pentland or of the Grampian hills, and the Grecian nymphs would lose their native charms by being transferred to the banks of the Ayr or Yarrow. Allan Ramsay, to be sure, in his own dialect, has given us some translations of the *Odes* of Horace, but in these the Roman features of the Venusian bard have been almost wholly obliterated, and no longer are we confronted with Horace in Rome, but with Horace in Edinburg, or rather with the pleasant, "blackavized, snob, dapper fellow," Allan Ramsay himself. So hard it is to keep out our own physiognomies in our translations. While aiming at approximation by assuming a dialect which we fancy is best adapted to express the native and peculiar graces of our author, instead of bringing him over thereby more fully into our language with all his true simplicity and worth about him, by that very means, it often happens, we disfigure him the more, depriving him not only of his personal but even of his national characteristics.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

PECULIAR ATTRACTION OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

(Translated from Schaff's Kirchenfreund.)

EVERY one of the Gospels possesses a leading characteristic, that for this reason constitutes its peculiar worth. Only by combining the outlines as drawn by all, can we form a complete image of Christ. A landscape presents different scenes according as it is viewed from different points of observation, and thus furnishes material for a variety of paintings; but these nevertheless correspond in the main, and complete the whole view reciprocally. Soerates was a man of so profound and rich a mind, that the labor of Plato and Xenophon, two men of entirely different mental habits, were necessary in order to unfold a full idea of his genius. With how much more force must not this principle hold true of Him, who was not only the archetype of human nature, and of all that is beautiful, noble and grand, but in whom besides all the fullness of the eternal Godhead dwelt in bodily form! Surely, to have but such a delineation drawn of himself, as would be a mere approximation to the full reality, the God-man, Jesus Christ, needed the service of more than a single mind.

Of all others, the peculiar character of the fourth Gospel stands out with greatest clearness. Although Matthew, Mark and Luke differ decidedly, and each one contributes his part to the living portrait of the Redeemer independently of the other; yet, they are intimately connected and together form a class, as soon as we institute a comparison between them and the Gospel according to John.

We are naturally led to expect from this favorite disciple the most penetrating and profound exhibition of the divine human character of our Lord. Lying on his Master's bosom, he listened to the softest notes of the music of heavenly love. Pure, confiding and susceptible, his whole being fitted him to receive a most accurate impress of Christ, the living image of divine life. Throughout the whole of this Gospel, therefore, we perceive the gentle respirations of Jesus' bosom, the peaceful, refreshing breathings of Heaven. Every page discloses the delightful joyousness of the Evangelist, feasting his soul as he holds a communion of life with the Son of God. But with it are blended tones of sadness and sacred grief, in view of the spiritual obtuseness and ingratitude of unbelieving men. This "son of thunder," on the one hand, carries us along in adoring admiration, as, borne on the pinions of profound reflection, he

ascends the heights of uncreated glory, which the eternal Son had with the Father before the foundation of the world. Like a royal eagle, that, attracted by the glory of the sun, is lost in delight while he flaps his athletic wings and describes his grand circles in the air, he sails on majestically towards the fountain of light. To follow the evangelist when he draws the sublime but simple outlines of his views of absolute truth and beauty, even the boldest and strongest thinker needs to collect all the energies of his genius. But, on the other hand, the utmost simplicity and the loveliest child-like spirit, are coupled with this daring flight of thought and this depth of reflection; our hearts are reached and he wins our entire confidence. Although his exhibition of divine truth is unfathomable, to a certain extent it is nevertheless adapted to the comprehension of a child. In this respect he resembles a quiet lake, so deep that men can not sound its abyss, yet so clear and transparent that its waters reflect the bright face of the full-orbed sun, and we cast our eyes over the gilded surface in rapture.

No wonder then, that from the beginning of its history, this Gospel has always attracted the most spiritual and profound theologians of every age with irresistible force. Origen calls it the main Gospel, which those only can comprehend who lie on the bosom of Jesus, and there imbibe the spirit that imbued John, just as he did the spirit of Christ. Chrysostom extols its celestial tones with all the ardor of his eloquence; it is a voice of thunder reverberating through the whole earth; notwithstanding its all-conquering power it does not utter a harsh sound, but is more lovely, bewitching and elevating in its influence than all the harmonies of music. Besides, it awakens the awe-inspiring consciousness, that it is big with the most precious gifts of grace, which elevate those who appropriate them to themselves above the earthly pursuits of this life, constitute them citizens of Heaven and heirs of the blessedness of angels. Augustine says: "Of the four Gospels, or rather the four books of but one Gospel, the one according to John, who may justly be compared to a soaring eagle as regards spiritual apprehension, is more elevated and sublime in its tone than the other three; and as he rises in his upward flight he seeks to carry us along with him. The first three evangelists say but little of the divine nature of our Lord, but associate with him as he appeared upon earth in the likeness of sinful flesh. But John, as if wearied with beholding the sojourn of Christ among men, rises in the very introduction to his Gospel not only above earth, air, and the spangled vault of heaven, but goes beyond the angelic host and all the orders

of invisible powers, and, fixing his eye on Him by whom all things were created, commences: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. From beginning to end the whole Gospel corresponds with the sublimity of this introduction. As he speaks of the divine personality of Jesus, none other does. He did but pour forth the water of life, which himself had drunk in. For he does not relate the fact without good reason, that at the last supper the beloved disciple lay his head on the Lord's bosom. From this bosom his soul drank in living streams. Then he revealed this secret communion to the world, that the world might become a partaker of his joy."

Luther speaks of the Gospel of John as being: "the only real Gospel, the leading, living one, that should be preferred by far to the others. John records mainly the discourses of Christ in his own words, from which we learn truth and life as taught by himself. The rest dwell at length upon his works." Calvin designates it as the key that opens the way to a right understanding of the other three. This Gospel reveals the soul of Christ; the others seek rather to describe his body. In a work on idolatry, Lessing pronounces it, without qualification, to be the most important portion of the New Testament. Ernesti calls it:—"The heart of Christ." Herder, in ecstasies, exclaims: "Written by the hand of an angel." In his work, entitled "*Weihnachtsfeier*" (celebration of Christmas) that extraordinary genius, Schleiermacher, expresses his own preference for John's Gospel in the language of Edward, the third speaker at the festival: "More mystical than any one of the four, communicates but little information about particular events, and does not even relate the actual birth of Christ, but eternal, child-like christmas-joys pervade its soul." Commentators of later date, such as Luecke, Olshausen and Tholuck share the same preference. The latter applies to it, in an elevated sense, the language of Hamann in reference to Claudius: "Thy harp sends forth light ethereal sounds that float gently in the air, and fill our hearts with tender sadness, even after its strings have ceased to vibrate." Profound philosophers have been particularly fascinated by the Introduction, (ch. i: 1-18), which may be regarded as a compendium of speculative wisdom. Fichte, during the latter and more religious period of his life, and Schelling, regard John as the typical representation of the perfect ideal church of the future.

Poets, too, have lavished their praises on this mysterious and wonderful production of the Apostolic age. Claudius, of "Wandsbeck," one of the most inoffensive, upright, sincere

and heartfelt popular writers of his time, has given a description of it, composed in the simple style of John himself, that has really become classic. He says: "Above all do I like to read the Gospel of John. There is something truly wonderful in it: twilight and night; and athwart flashes the vivid lightning. A calm evening sky, and on the back ground, see the large, full moon in very deed! Something sad, sublime, that fills my soul with longing! One never becomes satisfied! Every time I read John, it seems as if I could see him before me lying on the bosom of his Master at the last supper—as if his angel were standing by my side with a lamp in his hand, and, when I come to particular passages, would clasp me in his arms and whisper a word in my ear. There is a great deal that I do not understand when I read; but I often feel as if John's meaning were floating before me at a distance; even when my eye lights on a dark place, I have nevertheless a presentiment of a sense, sublime and glorious, that I shall some day understand. On this account I grasp eagerly at every new exposition of John's Gospel. But, alas, the most of them are only delighted with the evening sky, whilst the bright moon awakens very little admiration."

Cincinnati, O.

E. V. G.

LIEBNER'S CHRISTOLOGY.

Christologie oder die christologische Einheit des dogmatischen Systems, dargestellt von Dr. Th. A. Liebner. Erste Abtheilung. Göttingen, 1849.

THIS volume is introductory to a system of dogmatic theology, which it is proposed to construct from the christological principle. The author assumes that the true heart and core of all religion is the great fact of the incarnation, the living person of Jesus Christ, through which the life of man is restored to harmony with the life of God, and so redeemed at the same time from the curse of sin. To understand and represent properly then the glorious economy of the gospel, it is necessary to start with the idea of the incarnation, to make this the principle or foundation of the whole scheme of thought it is found to embrace. The doctrine of man on the one side, a sound and sufficient anthropology, and the doctrine of God on the other, a sound and sufficient theology, must both be conditioned in the nature of the case by a sound and sufficient christo-

ology, rightly setting forth the conjunction of these two forms of existence in the awful and mysterious personality of Him, who is at once both God and man. If this conjunction be at all natural and normal, and not a fantastical abnormality violently forced on the nature of man to serve a purpose, it must follow that the full sense of humanity is brought out finally only by its means; and that this becomes fully intelligible of course only as the survey of its parts and proportions is made to begin here, and is carried forward subsequently with continual reference throughout to the fundamental or principal fact, which is found to underlie thus at last the universal truth of man's life. And so we may say in like manner, that if the mystery of the incarnation be in real harmony with the nature of God, and not a mere docetic vision on this side as pretended by the old Gnostics, it must follow that the full sense of God's relations to the world—not of course his essential being, but the manifestation of what he is in the process of creation—is also reached at last only in this mystery, and becomes fully intelligible accordingly only by its means. That must ever be a false and mutilated view of the nature and history of man, which rests not on a firm apprehension of his true relationship to God, as this comes out ultimately in the constitution of the Messiah. That must ever be a false and defective view of the nature of God, as related to the world, which stops short of the theanthropy, as the true and necessary central sun that serves to irradiate and complete all other revelations by which he is known.

The system of theology to which we are here introduced by Dr. Liebner, is governed throughout, he tells us in his preface, by the thought, that Christianity is the absolutely last and highest form of religion, the system of all systems, the full and real end which all other forms of religion only reach after in the way of *nissus* or endeavor, and in which alone accordingly is to be found their proper truth. "This thought is one that is necessary to the Church, and one cannot partake truly in her life without coming under its power. For just as certainly as the Church carries in herself the consciousness of possessing the highest and richest life, even the holy and blessed life of Christ himself, and feels that the one thing needful is the full communication of this life through all the veins of the body of which he is the head; the very same assurance must she have intellectually, that she is in possession also of the absolutely highest, all comprehending and all controlling truth, or of the entire fullness of reason, to which all that may claim to be reason besides can stand related at best but as a fragmentary preparation."

Such assurance in substance the mind of the Church has carried in itself, through all ages ; and we find it frequently proclaimed, in terms more or less clear, by the proper representatives of this mind in the sphere of theology. Still the assurance is not itself a clear insight at once into the construction of the fact which is thus firmly felt to be true ; and we need not be surprised to find accordingly, that down to our own day the problem of a full and adequate representation of the central significance of the mystery now in view as being the real heart of all truth and reason besides, has never yet been brought to a conclusively round and complete solution. This however affects not at all the certainty of the fact itself, nor the reasonableness of the assurance by which it is held to be true ; it belongs only to theology as a science, to the theory of Christianity as the understanding seeks to master it in harmony with the knowledge it has of the world in other forms. At the same time theology as a science is itself part of the living process of Christianity, and needs continually to be advanced more and more in its own direction in order that this last may come to its full and perfect triumph. The theory of religion here, and the power of it in the actual world, what it is for the understanding and what it is for the life, must go forward hand in hand together ; and it is vain to look for the last universal success of the gospel under the second form, without a corresponding progress also under the first. It may be regarded then as a fact of much meaning and promise, that at the present time a new and more than usually active interest seems to be drawn on all sides towards the christological question, as one which is felt to lie at the root of all right theology, and to condition by its proper scientific solution the prosperity of all other christian interests. Liebner admits that much of the speculation which has been turned in this direction in modern times has been actuated by a spirit more or less hostile to the true sense of Christianity, and that even in its best character it has labored too generally under a false philosophical tendency, which has served materially to mar and vitiate its results. But this, he thinks, forms no reason for calling in question its significance, or refusing to make account of its endeavors and deeds. There is no good reason why the thinking even of Schelling or Hegel, though in no fellowship whatever with the christian faith as such, should not be acknowledged as of real weight for theological science, where it has to do even in a false and insufficient way with interests and relations which it is the province of such science to set in proper light. Theology can never be dissociated from the general progress of human thought. This moves with

organic necessity in one direction always, as a single whole; and it belongs to theology to move along with it, as the only power that can furnish a right response in the end to the vast and mighty interrogations with which it forms still the inmost burden of the age. In this way however it is quite possible, that the impulse to such new openings of thought, rendered necessary by the previous course of theology, may spring not immediately from the sphere of faith as such, but from the sphere of philosophy, and in this form seem even to carry an unfriendly aspect towards christian truth. Still in such case if the thought thus set in motion belong in truth to the actual philosophy of the world's mind at the time, it may be entitled notwithstanding to the earnest regard of those who take an interest in theology, as an indirect contribution at least to its service and benefit. Such merit beyond all doubt must be allowed to the later German philosophy, in its relations to the better German theology of the present time. It has served to force attention and inquiry towards questions, which had not been rightly answered before, and to which a full and fair answer is now required as the last sense of Protestantism and the innermost want of the age. Both Schelling and Hegel have struck in this way on more than one chord of thought, demanding and deserving universal regard in the bosom of the Church. In particular, the christological ideas of this last are very significant and full of instruction; for however monstrous they are in their own nature, and contrary to the truth as it is in Christ, they still bear striking testimony to the great central fact of the gospel, by seeking to solve in another way the problem with which it is concerned; whilst they make it necessary for christian science to go more deeply into its own truth, for the very purpose of bringing out clearly its superiority to the false speculation so plausibly presented in its place. And if we are bound to allow this much in favor even of Hegel, who will pretend that a still greater regard is not due to the professedly christian speculation of Schleiermacher, and others following more or less his theological influence, as occupied with the same profound and deeply interesting themes? It comes to nothing, that such deep earnest thinkers are found to deviate here and there from the established orthodoxy of their time, that they are chargeable with great and serious errors, and that it is not safe to follow them blindly in their theological speculations. We know well enough that it is not safe to follow any leader blindly, whether he be an original thinker or an easy traditionist who never thinks at all. That is not the question. We know too that Schleiermacher has fallen into serious errors. But what

then? Was he not still the theological Origen of his age? And is there no use whatever to be made of the activity of such a mind long and earnestly exercised on the deepest problems of religion, no profit at all to be expected or sought from his keen dialectical intelligence, and vast armory of learning, turned towards their solution? Alas for the misery of such a judgment as that. Say, that he has answered all questions wrong; yet who will pretend that he had not tact enough at least to know what questions actually lie in the way of theology as it now stands, and most loudly crave an answer at its hands; or that the endeavors of such a man to find the right answer deserve not the regard of inferior (even though more orthodox) minds, as instructive hints and helps at least by which they may be profitably guided towards something better? This only rational view of the matter we find taken by Dr. Liebner. He is not satisfied by any means with the christological efforts thus far of the modern time. He is not satisfied with the theory of Schleiermacher, nor with the light in which the subject is exhibited by Göschel, Dorner, Fischer, Martensen, or Lange. But he is not led by this, to undervalue and slight the labors of such men on this field; much less to set down the field itself as a waste of metaphysical thorns and briars, unworthy of culture. On the contrary, he finds in these manifold efforts of the great minds of the age, all looking in the same direction and grappling with the same profound questions, full evidence and proof that the general problem with which they are concerned lies in truth near the inmost heart of theology at the present time, and that all the interests of religion as well as those of philosophy call loudly from all sides for its right solution. However speculation may have failed, in one case or in fifty, to bring out such a solution in full satisfactory form, it has lost none of its force for this reason as constantly accumulating testimony to the reality, weight, and importance, of the fact it seeks to explain; whilst it must be taken also to determine conclusively at least some of the points and positions, that are necessarily comprehended in the subject as a whole.

Professor Liebner's work, now before us, falls into two parts. The first is occupied, at some length, with "the posture of the christological problem at the present time." The second, making up the main portion of the volume, is devoted to its general "theological and theanthropological solution."

In setting forth the present posture of the problem, the author directs attention, in the first place, to "the ecclesiastical and theological crisis now passing, and its relation to christology in gen-

eral;" and then brings into view what may be termed the "church and school christology as it now stands."

Theology, he tells us, may no longer shun the consciousness, that the Church is at this time passing, by as great a crisis as she has ever heretofore met, into a *new* order or state. The new in this case at the same time can come in properly, only as it is actively produced or brought to pass by waking mind. No mere tradition will now serve the purposes either of life or thought. The new must be positive in its nature; it is not found therefore in any merely negative or destructional tendencies of the age; these must be regarded at best but as signs of its approach, or solicitations inviting its presence. Still with such positive character, it must not be absolutely new, but a new stadium simply of the life of the Church, in strict historical connection with all that has gone before. No unhistorical movement in this form can ever deserve confidence. All real progress is conditioned indispensably by a full acquaintance with the previous course of theology, and a just reverence for its authority, as well as by a proper regard to the speculations of philosophy in the widest view. "Without a thoroughly comprehensive sense of this vast ecclesiastical back-ground, without a home familiarity with the past theoretical development of the Church, without having faithfully accompanied her sufferings, conflicts and victories, in the working out of her principle thus far, so as with true churchly sensorium to live them into himself as part of his own experience, no man can possibly lay hand anywhere with real effect to the theological work demanded by the wants of the present time; nay, no such man can have any right inwardly to lay his hand upon the work at all. It is impossible indeed to denounce too severely the folly, which pretends to bring help in such a case from abroad only, from any and every quarter as it may happen, and not from the bosom of the Church herself." This however implies no disregard for the resources of philosophy, but requires rather that they should be diligently studied and turned to account. These are part of the material, which true christian theology is bound to take up and employ for its own higher ends. "It is truly astonishing to see, in a retrospective view of the modern philosophy generally, how all its great heroes, partly without their own knowledge or will, have been forced to render even *positive* service to the christian cause; as it would seem indeed universally, that no great man, no genius, can be born and baptized in the church, without paying tribute in this way to Jesus Christ." It is high time, in this view, that theology should learn to look on all spheres of thought as right-

fully tributary to herself, and show her proper supremacy, neither by blindly following nor by blindly rejecting what they offer, but by appropriating out of it in a free way all that is capable of being assimilated to her own more powerful life. "The theology which refuses to give heed to the mighty questions, that have been set in motion by the modern philosophy in its vast wrestlings and endeavors called forth by the progress of the Protestant epoch, (questions indeed which only the full sense of Christianity can ever answer—but this also only as wrought out into the form of science,) must be set down as utterly unequal to the necessities of the age."

All other theological questions belonging to the general crisis of the age, in the judgment of the author, gather themselves up centrally at last in the sphere of *christology*. Here ultimately are to be referred all difficulties and perplexities in the science of religion, and to this deep ground we must trace them in order to their proper answer. The first grand question accordingly regards the possibility of a christology at all in the sense of the Church, in some such form as this: Has the Church in the substance of her christology, that is, in that with which she must stand or fall, in the fundamental idea of the true and real God-man, rightly apprehended the nature of christianity?

To be of any real force, this idea must be more of course than an empty sound or notion. It must be such as to meet and master fairly the contradiction, with which it is encountered in all the factors that enter into its constitution. This has become more profound and comprehensive in our age than ever before. The factors in question are Divinity, Humanity, and Nature. On the ground of these severally we find pantheism, a false doctrine of freedom, and a false naturalism, arrayed in opposition to the whole truth and possibility of the christological mystery. To retain then firm hold of her own faith here, the Church is required and urged to dissolve the force of these most hard and difficult issues, by setting them in full harmony with the sense of this faith, as the true ground where they all come finally to their proper meaning. In other words, to surmount scientifically the false tendencies of the age in the several directions now noticed, she is called, as the possessor of all truth, not to ignore them with suicidal self-will, but to satisfy rather in a true way the problems they are seeking to satisfy in a false way. Over against the antichristian pantheism, ethicism, and naturalism, of the age, the case needs a truly christian pantheism, in the sense of Paul's *ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν ᾧ ὡν*, a corresponding scheme of humanity, and a corresponding theory of nature also, in which

full justice may be shown to each sphere, while all come together in Christ. All this the possibility of a christology in the sense of the Bible, the realness of the great fact of the incarnation as it has entered into the faith of the christian world through all ages, is felt to involve; and the leading thought of the time accordingly, in the estimation of our author, that which more than any other stirs the inmost depths of its life, is the verification of the full sense of the evangelical mystery through all its length and breadth just in this form. "Christianity demands practical acknowledgment as being in truth the absolute religion, and seeks to show itself, as the highest divine-human power in the world, at once commensurate in force with its universal life and being; a power, in which consequently not merely all truly ideal forces are hid, all treasures of wisdom and knowledge in the form of thought, but that contains also the real force by which the world is carried forward toward its absolute end, the full harmony namely of nature, humanity and God—humanity the organ of God and nature the organ of man in such divine union—the kingdom of God fully come; a power, through which thus what appears in the creation of nature and man in the first place under a potential form only, is made to receive the principle of its absolute actualization. Such a system of the absolute involves necessarily for its centre the *christological*, Christ the God-man, as the personal medium and support of the whole. The absolute religion and Christ the *personal absolute religion*, imply one another; or the first without the second would be a periphery without centre. In its more general form, as referring to religion at large—humanity the organ of God and nature the organ of man in union with God—the thought before us is most immediately accessible, and has been frequently brought out, or at least felt after, in the latest times, even in the sphere of philosophy; its necessary relation to the christological idea is less seen, although it is an oversight of endless consequence to think of constructing the other without this. To understand both now in their true inward union, and so to set forth the whole world-moving and world-mastering power of Christianity in the strictest sense, forms at present the highest problem of theology, in the solution of which it must find its deepest self-satisfaction, the key for the right understanding of the age, and that intellectual energy which is needed for all true church activity."—P. 10-11.

Two great points, according to Professor Liebner, are pressing towards new determination particularly at this time, in the movement of the christological question. The first is, "the idea of a

theanthropology independently even of sin and its removal; or the idea that God's incarnation stands in an original essential and necessary relation to humanity, and so to the creation itself, as their completion." The second is "the necessity of advancing, on purely christian trinitarian grounds, and in a way that may surmount all pantheistic and Ebionitic views, to such a unity of the true divine-human person, or of the person in which God has really become man, as may leave *no longer possible* the consequence of a personal disruption of Christ, a dualism involving finally again the going asunder of the two factors, the divine and the human, in his constitution."

"We are well aware," the author remarks, "that the first point, in its most general expression, *the necessity of God's taking flesh,*¹ is still offensive to many, in view especially of its having of late been urged mainly in a form at variance with full christian truth. It has been made to carry in part a pantheistic aspect, or avoiding this it has been directed against the right view of the Trinity, or it has been used finally to corrupt the true doctrine of man's nature as regards sin. All these phases however have no necessary connection with it, but are only a foreign garment thrown around it, or misrepresentations we may say through which the idea but seeks to reach its own right sense. In its proper truth, which was not unknown to the earlier ages of the Church, it belongs rather to genuine christian theism, standing in full agreement with the doctrines of the Trinity, of the creation, and of human freedom, and not at all presupposing the original necessity or inevitableness of sin; nay, in this true character it claims to enter essentially and indispensably into the very ground of Christianity itself, and to be in the heart of it the actual key of the universal christian system, with which only its absolute fulness can ever be fairly unlocked and revealed.—In virtue of the absolute unity of the eternal purpose of divine love toward the world revealed in Christ, the idea of the world in the christian theistic sense, humanity appears christologically determined and disposed even in its creation itself, forms in its essence and teleology an organic system which has its principle in Christ, the *God-man*. Christ, even without regard to sin, which belongs not to the conception of man, is the divine-human head of humanity as his *σῶμα*; both are inseparably joined to-

¹ "Of course under the supposition of the creation. *Freedom* characterises God's relation *as a whole* to the world; it is a system of *free* divine revelation, which includes the stages of creation and the incarnation."

gether as *one* organism. God creates humanity, to communicate himself to it as his personal creature, in the way of real revelation, and so to bring it into perfect communion with himself, which is the full idea of religion. This real self-manifestation, self-communication of God to humanity, completes itself and finds perfect satisfaction only in the central and universal *person of the God-man*, which forms accordingly the completion of humanity itself. The purely harmartological, soteriological method of accounting for the incarnation, (man sinned and *therefore* only the eternal Son of God became man,) which in the age of the Reformation acquired prominence over against a corrupt theory of sin and salvation, is no longer sufficient. To overcome the more general and deeper contradictions of the latest times, it is necessary to descend more profoundly into the ground of Christianity itself, which is just the idea we have here in view; so that this, in union with the true doctrine of salvation, alone contains full power over these contradictions, and in particular the most perfect and decisive corrective for anti-christian pantheism, which well knew what it was about in seeking to master the idea in its own sense.—Sin served only to bring in this modification, which indeed reaches far and deep, that now Christ appears also as a Redeemer and Sacrifice. This sense moreover, when we eye it sharply, will be found to lie in the whole depth of the Protestant (scriptural) principle of justification by faith. For since Christ not only takes away sin or guilt, but also positively gives his whole personal divine-human being to mankind for their positive righteousness, (humanity in every case righteous before God only through faith in Christ, its theanthropic head, all loved only in One, on whom rests the absolute favor of the Father,) this doctrine requires under such positive aspect the acknowledgment, that aside from sin even Christ is the all fulfilling principle of perfection for the race. The whole weight of the soteriological view, (which in the scriptures of course stands out in strong relief,) loses nothing in fact by this idea, but rather finds in it first its proper support; nay, even the *O felix culpa Adami*, retains its truth; since that is certainly a new depth of love, which challenged by sin engages the God-man to humble himself even to the curse of death for the redemption of the nature he was pleased to assume.”—P. 13–14.

The second point named, we are told, the bringing of the hypostatical mystery to a fully satisfactory expression between the opposing rocks of pantheism and dualism, has never yet been successfully gained; although it has always been kept steadily

in view by the faith of the Church, as an object never to be surrendered to any pressure whether to the one side or the other. This is confirmed by proper historical notices, including particularly the later efforts both of the Lutheran and of the Reformed theology on this field. Account is taken also in a general way of the several speculative christological schemes which have been brought forward in modern times, (by Göschel and others,) which are found to fall short of what is here required, though offering indispensable elements for the right solution finally of its problem.

"That this right solution of the problem here in view," says Schoeberlein,¹ "still remains a desideratum for theology, is not to be denied. Neither the Lutheran² nor the Reformed sections of the Church have yet been able to represent the *theanthropic person in true unity*. The onesided theological leaning of the Lutheran confession has run into docetic consequences, while the onesided anthropological tendency of the Reformed has run into Ebionitic consequences. And the middle view of Zinzendorf and others, which supposes a transformation or letting down of the Logos into a holy man, is no real medium, but leaves the christian consciousness unsatisfied in both directions."

The second part of the work, as already said, is devoted to what the author holds to be the right method of answering the great questions which he thus brings into view. The God-man, he tells us, must be *ethically* apprehended. All other modes of representation give only a transient show of knowledge. "A truly *ethical theanthropology*, if it can be reached, must furnish the key at the same time for all christological questions. Such an ethical theanthropology presupposes inwardly however, not only a truly ethical anthropology, but most of all a theology also, in which as the culmination of ethics is given the possibility of a true confluence of the anthropological and the theological in the theanthropological. *All this forms then the proper*

¹ In an able review of Liebner's work, approving and endorsing its main substance, in *Reuter's Repertorium* for September 1850.

² It is hardly necessary to remark, that the reference here is to Lutheranism in the sense which the word carries in Germany, where account is still made of the old distinction between the two great Protestant confessions as something real and important. As for our so called "*American Lutheranism*," which is another thing altogether, a system after the order of Melchisedeck, without genealogy or history, or like the men of Cadmus purely autochthonic—it is not to be supposed, of course, that it should take any interest in this christological question, or in any other bearing directly on the heart of the original Lutheran theology.

christian system. Christianity is essentially an ethical system. The ideas of moral personality, freedom and love, which go far beyond the merely logical and physical, are its inmost marrow. In these it rests, and this universally—in its doctrine of God, no less than in its doctrines of man and of the God-man. It is just for this reason that the christian system is the highest, the system of all systems.” Thus it becomes necessary, for the construction of a right christology, to fall back on its ultimate grounds in a true christian theology or right doctrine of God. The three spheres, Man, Christ, God, throw light continually on each other; but it is in the last only we are to seek finally the full sense of the whole. “That is, we must follow the grand objective course of the christian system itself, as it goes forth from the idea of God. The highest truth of this idea however is the christian doctrine of the Trinity, which is itself in truth but the idea of God in full ethical form. The ethical idea authenticates itself here in this, that by its means the doctrine of the Trinity, (what has always been its greatest difficulty,) can be carried out so as to avoid truly both tritheism on the one side and subordinationism on the other. Within the doctrine of the Trinity is to be found then the principle, which lies immediately at the foundation of the ethical idea of the human and the divine human, Man and Christ. This will sum up the whole sense of the christian doctrine of the Logos; whilst it brings out at the same time also the true christological scheme of the world, which is the unity of creation and the incarnation.”—*P.* 66.

What the author proposes thus is to bring out the proper *ethical* foundation of the christian mystery, (in contradistinction to the insufficient grounds, more or less logical or physical merely, which have been rested upon too generally in the previous christological theories, which he finds occasion to reject for this very reason,) by getting back to its true original and only sufficient seat in a corresponding view of the Godhead, under its christian eternal distinction of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This leads him through a profound speculative inquiry into the constitution of the Trinity, in which the text, “*GOD IS LOVE*,” is taken as a guiding pole-star, to be kept constantly in view in the criticism and rejection of what is false as well as in the determination of what is held to be true. The only right order here is to begin at once not with the abstract, but with the concrete, not with the conception of God in its lowest and most general character, but with this conception as it meets us in its full ethical force in the New Testament. In the way of preparation however for this, it is found well to pass in review the several theories by which

it has been attempted to construct the idea of God speculatively from a subordinate and incomplete stand-point, commencing with the extreme abstraction of the Eleatic philosophy, and taking other schemes afterwards in the order of their approximation towards the proper fulness of the idea in its perfect form. This criticism sets aside as unsatisfactory the schemes of Schleiermacher and Hegel, and also the metaphysics of the older Protestant theology, (in which God is defined as *mera et simplicissima essentia*,) as well as the "absolute substance" of Spinoza. Having brought this task to a close, the author finds the way fairly and fully open for the positive presentation of his own scheme or system, and to that object accordingly the latter part of his work is mainly devoted.

In this we shall not pretend to follow him here, even with the most general sketch; for our limits forbid anything like a satisfactory report of his argument in this form; and it would not be right, in the case of so deep and difficult a subject, to hazard either the credit of the book or the claims of truth, on any merely cursory and fragmentary representation, in which terms and propositions must be continually in danger of being taken either in a wrong sense or it may be in no sense at all. Our chief purpose has been, in connection with the book, to call attention to the deeply significant interest of its subject; and with its help to set forth in a general way the nature of this subject, the character and sense of the christological question or problem, as it now enters particularly into the very life of the Church, practical as well as theoretical, and from all sides loudly claims due audience and response.

There can be no doubt, but that this work of Professor Liebner forms a most valuable addition to modern scientific theology. It is the fruit of most profound and vigorous thought, upheld and replenished throughout by the most comprehensive learning. It is not for the superficial, or for such as take no earnest interest in theology; for whom all severe thinking in this direction is a burden, who will have it that all theology is at an end, and who are ready to cry down for this reason as transcendental mystification whatever goes ever so little beyond the poorest commonplace categories that happen to have become lodged in their own brain; caring not to see, and in their blindness having no power to see, that these same easy categories involve at bottom the very essence of rationalism itself. Liebner's book, we say, is for no such readers; nor are such ever likely to travel far into its pages. But theology, thank God, is not yet given up to the mercy of this lackadaisical school. It is still with many a living

science, as religion also is for them not merely a dead mechanical tradition, but the most concrete and earnest among the interests of life. Such will be prepared to hail the appearance of this great work, as well as of every other, which seeks under the guidance of a truly evangelical spirit to carry the torch of science into the farthest depths of the kingdom of God. It is to be regretted at the same time, that the work is by no means as clear in its style and form, as the richness of its contents deserves. It is far enough from being loose or unscientific in its method; it is pervaded with principial unity and rigid logical connection throughout; but still the method is a good deal involved, and such as it costs more effort than the case necessarily required to keep steadily in sight. The style moreover is a good deal cumbersome and hard, abounding in long complicated sentences, with all sorts of parenthetic interruption—making it necessary for the reader to keep his attention continually on the stretch, and often to read backwards as well as forwards, in order to get with safe intelligence at all to the end of the tangled labyrinth of words with which he finds himself surrounded. A better literary form, in the general view now noticed, would serve materially to assist the influence and credit which it so well deserves to carry with it on other grounds.

We find in the August and September numbers of Reuter's Repertorium, published in Berlin, an additional contribution to the literature of this great subject from the pen of Professor Liebner, in reply to some strictures made on his book in another journal by the distinguished Lutheran theologian, Dr. Thomasius; of whose labors in the same department, (for he also has written a special treatise it seems on the constitution of Christ's person,) Liebner in his book speaks with the highest respect, though he calls in question their full success. The difference and controversy turn on the view taken of the *Trinity*, on the question concerning *the necessity of the Divine Incarnation*, and on the way of carrying out the doctrine of the *αὐτογένεσις* or *Inanition* of the Logos.

Liebner takes up first the second point, which he considers of primary account for the present state of theology, and towards which the main stress of objection from the other side would appear to be directed. He complains however, that Thomasius enters but little into the real merits of the question; which indeed is hardly allowed even to come into view clearly in his criticism. "The question relates to the proposition, that Humanity is *made* with reference to Christ; or in other words that the free act of creation draws after it with necessity the mystery

of the incarnation; that these two facts go to make up one whole self-revelation of God in the world: an idea, whose germ is presented to us in the Bible, particularly by St. Paul, and which has had its patrons in a whole succession of church divines in ancient, middle, and modern times. Thomasius however thinks it enough to bring forward one single formula, employed by me to express the thought, which he finds not to his mind, and then dismisses with the vague charge of pantheism—in the style of too many of our otherwise respectable theologians, who are accustomed to dispose summarily of all that squares not with their own habit by some similar dogmatically sweeping note.¹ All the rest of my book bearing on the point, the pains in particular that are taken to show that the idea in question is grounded in the constitution of Christianity, and in full harmony with the christian conceptions of God, of the creation, and of the moral liberty of man forming indeed the key that is necessary to unlock the inmost sense of the whole; all this, I say, he hides from the eyes of his readers as well as from his own. This is a grief to me, I say it honestly, not so much on my own account, as for the sake especially of those *Lutheran* readers, who look mainly to the excellent journal here in hand for information, but in *this* case must be led wholly astray—in regard to a book which to *them* especially would fain not continue unknown.”

It may be worth while here to follow the article briefly, in its attempt to show particularly, “that the *christian doctrine of sin* can not be carried out rightly on all sides, without the idea of the necessity of the incarnation, and so of the original and essential relation of Christ to humanity, even in its first creation, and without regard to sin or its removal.”

Two points require to be secured in the christian doctrine of sin, the freedom of man on the one side, and the fact that God is not the author of it on the other. But now the unity of God's plan of the world seems to require, that sin, which opens the way for redemption, the centre of all God's counsels in regard to the world and the end of all his revelations, should for this very reason enter into this plan and be included in the aim and purpose (divine teleology) of the world as a whole. Here arise vast difficulties, from which there can be no full escape without the intervention of some new principle, that may serve to set in

¹ The fault of some respectable theologians also in our own wise and free America, as well as of some who are not very respectable.

harmony the seemingly discordant views from which they spring. This help is found actually, according to Professor Liebner, in the idea just stated, and nowhere else.

The end of man's creation is full communion with God himself. This is religion in its highest and most absolute form; which thus becomes the end of the whole creation, whose last sense is man. A failure in this object must be taken then as a failure of the whole creation, so far as this world is concerned. To an *unconditional* realization of such absolute religion however, man's life is conducted only in the incarnation of the eternal Son of God, that is in the central and universal person of the true and real God-man, who just in this way completes the process of God's self-communication, the sense of all his revelations, as the completion of humanity itself; he is the personal absolute religion. The incarnation becomes thus the absolute and unconditional centre of God's free purposes of love towards the world; or which is the same thing, the real centre and hinge of all history. This hinders not the entrance of sin, by the free act of Adam, and its settlement in the general life of the race; but however the billows of that awful curse may triumph in every other quarter, on this rock in the end they must break. The membership of the race might fail, in the necessary exercise of its own freedom; there was security still in the *head*, that in such contingency the whole ethical idea of the world, as this lay in the mind of God when he called it into being, should not fail, but be carried forward notwithstanding to its triumphant conclusion. The destiny of man stood safe in the coming Second Adam, though all might seem to be lost for a time by the fall of the First; only it became necessary in this case, that his appearance in the world should be that of a suffering, atoning Redeemer; a result that has served however to bring in a more glorious dispensation of grace, according to Rom. v: 15-21, than all that could possibly have been reached in any different way. "Christ, the God-man, the personal absolute religion, is and remains still the essential end and scope of the whole creation, (Coloss. i: 15-16—*τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἵκισταται*,) and so far has his end originally in himself, but in the fulness of his love makes himself at the same time the means of redemption for sinful humanity. Thus have we a perfect theodicy, in which the freedom of man is saved in harmony with the full stability and unity of the Divine world plan."

If on the other hand the incarnation of the eternal Son be not taken into the original scheme of the world, be not thought of as its centre according to Coloss. i: 15-16, but only as a contriv-

ance to destroy sin the bad fruit of man's freedom, which being free thus *might not have been at all*; or if the complete revelation of God and the proper consummation of humanity stand not unconditionally sure in Christ, if the crowning sense of all here be not *absolutely predestinated*, if the Son of God be not, as eternally in the Trinity, so also in History, the one whole and full object of the Divine complacency, and all besides acceptable only in him and through him, all partaking of his fulness as the Head:—if this be not the original and necessary order of the creation itself, but only an after thought brought into it by the tremendous accident of sin, the whole economy both of Nature and of Christianity is indeed thrown into hopeless confusion, as being throughout at the mercy of chance. There remains nothing that is unconditional, necessary, and absolutely eternal, either in God's plan or in his actual work. All becomes a sea of uncertainty, where in fact the end falls out in no harmony whatever with the beginning. The rescue of man's freedom at such cost is too dear.

Two ways have been fallen upon by deep thinkers, pressed with the sense of this difficulty, to uphold the interest of God's sovereignty thus brought into danger—which however soon run into equal difficulty on the opposite side.

The first is that of Calvin. "A great truth undoubtedly enters into his system, to which it owes its power, and in view of which only it is possible to understand or explain its far reaching influence. Here, if anywhere, the proposition holds good, that an error is strong only through the residue of truth it still contains. God's sovereignty must indeed be *unconditionally* secured. But this can be done truly only in another way. If that be not found, if it be not seen how the Divine idea or decree stands unconditionally sure of its own end in the God-man, whether the Adamic probation lead the life of the race through sin or not, there can be no possible escape for strict thinking from the Calvinistic consequence, as among others Schleiermacher also has so strikingly shown.

"The second false way, which however only carries out the full meaning of the first, the one view at bottom involving the other, consists in resolving sin into an *anthropological* necessity—such as serves at last in truth to throw it back on God. Man is taken to be so *made*, in the relation of his lower and higher powers, nature and spirit, that with his development sin takes place necessarily, the higher part of his nature being bound by the lower, which rightly it should rule. Sin thus has not come *into* man, but grows forth from his original constitution, as

part of God's work." In exemplification of this view, which he takes to be so closely related to that of Calvin, Liebner refers to the theories of Schleiermacher and Rothe, as well as to the speculations of Fichte and Hegel on the idea of sin.

From these plausible schemes, which draw their strength for thoughtful minds from the great interest of the Divine sovereignty, the only adequate deliverance is found, he thinks, in the theory which includes in the conception of the creation itself the idea of the incarnation, as the last necessary sense of the world. Grant this, and there is no longer any reason or temptation to resolve sin into an anthropological necessity, the fault of man's nature, or to lay the burden of its origin on God. It falls on the freedom of the human will, where it is made to fall in the Bible. We recognize no necessity in its introduction into the sphere of man's life. "On the contrary, we see a necessity rather of a wholly different sort; namely this, that if humanity have not the character of goodness in its original constitution, as this comes from God, by no possible human act can it ever *become* really good; it must remain forever involved in the contradiction of wrongly balanced and adjusted powers with which it has been doomed to start. Even a *true* incarnation in this case, a sinless Christ, must be impossible. In other words, if sin be not something brought *into* humanity, as no proper part of it, it can never be brought *out* of it even by redemption itself. With this falls to the ground the whole puzzling system of Schleiermacher in regard to sin and redemption, in which neither sin is sin properly nor redemption properly redemption. And even Rothe's masterly and classical exposition, which goes beyond Schleiermacher's physical categories in its view of freedom and proper personality, has truth for us only as an uncommonly acute delineation of the actual development of man's sinful nature as it now stands, not as a speculative construction of its sinful development as it stood in the beginning."

It amounts to nothing here, according to Liebner, that Thomasius and others standing on the same general ground are ready to say: "We are not in this fault, we do not make sin necessary." That is only to their private benefit; the case however regards the *doctrine of the Church*; which needs to be so set forth, that these theories of the original necessity or unavoidableness of sin may no longer be able to uphold themselves as logically indispensable. It must be counted ever a poor interest for church orthodoxy, which simply closes its eyes to the difficulties that surround it, and so quarrels with every effort that is made to meet and solve them on the part of others.

In this general way Prof. Liebner vindicates the view he takes of the necessary relation of Christ to the world. The subject is to be taken up in its soteriological relations fully and specially, he tells us, in the second part of his work, the appearance of which we anticipate with no small interest. Our business at present has been simply to bring it before our readers in the way of report, without pretending to pass upon it any judgment of our own.

In the second part of his article in reply to Thomasius, our author takes up the charge of pantheism, and shows very satisfactorily as it seems to us that it is in this case, as employed against his book, a mere empty sound without any force whatever. There is much more room, he thinks, for urging this very difficulty on the general view of Thomasius himself. It needs at all events to be well considered and kept in mind, that the danger of pantheism can never be fairly avoided, by simply falling over into the arms of an abstract deism. And most especially must that be counted a poor and shallow conception here, by which the idea of Christ's central posture as the Son of Man, in and by whom only our entire humanity can become complete, is taken to imply the falling away in any measure of the grand original and eternal distinction that must ever hold between Himself and the persons of his people. But this point we are not called to take up at the present time.

J. W. N.

RECOLLECTIONS OF NEANDER.

AMONG the world renowned men, who during the summer of 1850 have been gathered in quick succession to the dead, stands conspicuous the German church father, Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER, after Schleiermacher the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century. True, he has occupied no ministerial post, like Robert Peel, has won no laurels of victory, like General Taylor, has adorned no throne, like Louis Philippe, and in the loud tumult of public worldly life his voice was not heard. But from his solitary study, Neander has exercised an influence quite as far reaching as that of any of his companions in time and death; an influence, whose action was only more deep and beneficent by being inward and spiritual, and the force of which will continue to be felt without interruption as long as theologians and

ministers of the gospel shall be trained for their heaven appointed work. Though political history knows nothing of the quiet, humble scholar in Berlin, his name shines but the more illustriously for this in the records of the kingdom of God, which outlasts all earthly governments and sets at defiance even the gates of hell. Though too no monument should be raised to him of brass or marble, a far fairer and more imperishable memorial is already secured to him in the grateful hearts of thousands, who have been his hearers or readers, or who in coming time shall draw from his *works* a knowledge of the sorrows and joys, the conflicts and triumphs, the all pervading and transforming heaven-like nature of the church of Jesus Christ, as well as from his *life* the priceless doctrine—that all true spiritual and moral greatness roots itself in *simplicity, humility and love*.

The outward history of Neander may be told in few words; as his whole life was spent in the study and lecture room. Born at Göttingen on the 16th of January in the year 1789, educated in the gymnasium at Hamburg and the university at Halle, a convert in youth from Judaism to the christian faith, and thenceforward self-devoted with entire soul to the study of divinity, he made his appearance a. 1811 as private teacher at Heidelberg, and already in the 22nd year of his age, by his well known work on Julian the Apostate, settled his vocation to become the historian of the church. Soon after, a. 1812, he received a call as Professor of Theology to the newly founded university of Berlin; which through him, Schleiermacher, de Wette, Marheinecke, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Fichte, Hegel, Böckh, Lachmann, Ritter, Ranke, and other no less celebrated names in all departments of learning, sprang forward with unexampled growth, and rose to be the metropolis of German science. Here he labored as a lecturer and writer, by doctrine and by example, on till his death on the 14th of July, 1850; only now and then breaking the uniformity of his existence, by a vacation trip, in company with his sister or with some student, for the benefit of his weak health and to consult rare books or manuscripts in the libraries at Vienna, Munich, Brunswick or elsewhere.

Behind this monotonous exterior however, lay hid the richest spiritual life; and it must be exceedingly interesting to follow its gradual development on to full maturity, especially his conversion to Christianity and the different influences which led him to his peculiar theological standpoint. Among these would have to be named before all the study of *Plato*, which kindled in him also, as formerly in the Alexandrian Fathers and in St. Augustine, an "incredible fire" of enthusiasm for the ideal, and

served as a scientific school-master unto Christ; or still more perhaps his early contact with *Schleiermacher*, who by his animated "Discourses on Religion," like a priest in the outer court of Nature, conducted so many of the noblest and most gifted youth of the time out of the dry heath of the then dominant Rationalism at least to the threshold of Revelation. To this German Plato, his teacher in Halle and his colleague for many years afterwards in Berlin, Neander too stood indebted, as he himself always cheerfully acknowledged, for manifold quickening impulses, as he continued also most reverentially attached to him through life; although he differed from him materially in weighty points, particularly on the doctrine of sin, and had no sympathy with the pantheistic elements of his system, being altogether much more positive and realistic in his religious convictions. Valuable materials for such an inward spiritual history are already furnished, in the correspondence with his university friend, the poet Chamisso, which was published some years since, and are to be found still more richly we may presume among his unpublished letters and papers. No doubt also some competent hand, having all these resources in reach, will soon be applied to the important task of providing a complete biography of the father of church history in its recent form. We have for this neither inward nor outward call, and propose here simply, as our title imports, some *recollections* of Neander, as he came before us in his riper years, reserving for a future article some notice of his character as a theologian and more particularly as a church historian. We discharge thus not merely a service which others have asked at our hands, but a duty of gratitude also in our own mind towards a never to be forgotten instructor and friend.

In his *outward appearance*, to begin with what struck every one in an unusual degree, Neander was a perfect original, we might almost say one of the rarest natural curiosities. Even his clothing, a well worn coat of the ancient cut—we never knew him to wear a dress coat—jack-boots reaching above the knees, a white cravat carelessly tied; often on one side of the neck or behind it, an old fashioned hat set aslant on the back of his head, presented an oddity, which seemed to mock the elegant refinement of Berlin, and yet was greeted respectfully by every body, from the king to the loungee at the street corner. His absolute freedom from all that belongs to the stuff of vanity, and his extraordinary indifference to all outward things, gave occasion to the most ludicrous anecdotes; as for instance, that he set off at times for the lecture room *sans culotte* and in his

night gown, but would be happily fetched back by his sister ; or that, having once got with one foot into the gutter, he hobbled along the whole length of the street in this predicament, and as soon as he got home sent anxiously for a physician to cure him of his imaginary lameness! *Se non è vero, è ben trovato*. He was of a slender bodily frame, of middling size, with strongly marked Jewish though at the same time most benevolent and good natured features, the eyes deeply seated and full of spirit, overshadowed as with a roof by an unusually strong bushy pair of eye-brows. Thus he sat in his solitary study in the Markgrafen-street, surrounded with the spirits of church fathers, schoolmen, mystics, and reformers, whose works lay on all sides in learned disorder, against the walls, on the floor, on tables and chairs, so that visitors could scarcely find a place on an old fashioned sofa for sitting down, while the way out into the dining room, and into the decently furnished parlor of the sister, led so to speak over pure corpses. Still more odd if possible was the appearance of the good man on the rostrum. As he could hardly have found the way by himself, and must have been put in danger by the moving crowd of vehicles and men, a student accompanied him every day to the university building as far as the reading room, where the professors and private teachers are accustomed to entertain themselves during recess. From this he proceeded alone into his lecture room, which was quite close at hand, shooting in sideways; seized first of all a couple of goose quills, which must be regularly laid upon the desk before hand, to keep his fingers employed, and then began his lecture ; spinning forth from his mind one idea after another with the greatest earnestness and zeal, without any other help than that of some illegible notices and citations ; standing, but constantly changing the position of his feet ; bent forward ; frequently sinking his head behind the desk to discharge a morbid flow of spittle, and then again suddenly throwing it on high, especially when roused to polemic violence ; at times threatening even to overturn the rostrum. The whole scene was so strange and eccentric, that one who heard him for the first time could hardly contain himself for astonishment, and had no power at all to follow him with the pen. And yet still the earnestness, the dignity, the enthusiasm of the eccentric professor, the extraordinary learning and power of thought that appeared in his lectures, restrained all laughter, nay, his personal aspect itself had always even on the first acquaintance something in it that inspired reverence and at the same time called forth confidence and love. In a short time moreover one grew accustomed to his strange exterior,

the comical form vanished before its own solid contents, and served only to make them the object of higher admiration. For Neander all this was perfectly natural, and without the remotest thought of effect; altogether indeed there never was perhaps a man more free from affectation.

All these singularities of his outward appearance indicated, that he was a stranger on this earth, and that he was formed wholly for the kingdom of the *idea*. His ignorance of worldly life and business, his perfect freedom from all the temptations of sensuality and vanity, his superiority to much that for others forms an indispensable need, his indifference towards the material side of existence, fitted him for his purely inward calling and for undisturbed communion with the still spirit world of the past. He was an eunuch from his mother's womb, and consecrated this gift to the Lord, became thus also an eunuch for the kingdom of God's sake (Matt. xix: 12). He belonged to the exceptions, for whom the life of celibacy is a moral duty, and the means of greater activity and success, as it was for Paul and Barnabas. Instead of a wife however, God had given him a true female companion in the person of a similarly unmarried sister, who took on her the care of his few wants with the most tender devotion, attended him almost daily in his walks under the lindens, and with kind hospitality entertained his numerous friends and pupils. She was also indeed highly peculiar, intellectual withal, and not wanting in wit and literary culture, but at the same time was a good housekeeper and altogether a very sensible practical person, supplying thus her brother's defect. The peaceful and innocent living together of this original pair had in it something uncommonly touching, and no one could mistake the wise hand of Providence in their connection, for the accomplishment of the great spiritual work, to which Neander, so to speak, had been predestinated.

As regards the *character* of Neander, it was universally esteemed and admired. True, he also had decided theological opponents; for the Orthodox of the more strict class he was in many points too lax and yielding, for the Rationalists too positive and firm; but all entertained for his character a sort of sacred veneration, and treated him accordingly with much more mildness and forbearance than is usual with such difference of views. His unusual learning was not of itself sufficient to protect him from assault; what surrounded him as an impenetrable tower, and made him invulnerable, was his moral purity and elevation, which at once struck even the most superficial observer, and in regard to which all room for doubt was cut off by his

showing himself always immediately as he was, the very personification thus of the simplicity of the dove. Any attack upon his character, any impeachment of his motives, could have sprung only from stock blind passion, would have awakened indignation throughout the whole theological camp of Germany, and so must have resulted almost inevitably in the moral discomfiture of the antagonist himself. Neander was one of those truly great men, with whom theory and practice, head and heart, fall perfectly together. Not without reason had he chosen for his motto: "*Pectus est quod theologum facit.*" He pursued theology, not as an exercise of the understanding merely, but always as a sacred business of the heart also, which he felt to be most intimately connected with the highest and most solemn interests of man, his eternal welfare and worth. The living centre and heart's blood of the science was for him faith in Jesus Christ, as the highest revelation of a holy and merciful God, as the fountain of all salvation and sanctifying grace for the world. Whatever he found that was really great, noble, good and true in history, he referred directly or indirectly to the fact of the incarnation, in which he humbly adored the central sun of all history and the innermost sanctuary of the moral universe. There were no doubt more orthodox theologians than Neander; for it is well known, that with all his regard for the symbolical books, he would never confine himself to their measure and conscientiously refused to sign the Augsburg Confession; but among all there was not one perhaps, in whom doctrine was to the same extent life and power, in whom theoretic conviction had so fully passed over into flesh and blood, in whom the love of Christ and of man glowed with so warm and bright a flame. Here, in this unfeigned life-breathing piety, which had its root in Christ's person and gospel and formed the foundation of all his theology, lay the irresistibly attractive charm of his lectures for every piously disposed hearer, and the edifying character of all his writings. Whilst however in this practical soul engaging character of his theology he fell in with the pietistic school of Spener and Franke, which asserted just this side of religion, the rights of the heart, the necessity of a *theologia regenitorum*, over against a lifeless orthodoxy of the intellect—he was on the other hand far removed from all pietistic narrowness and circumscription. His extended historical studies had served to enlarge his naturally liberal mind to the most comprehensive catholicity, which it were gross wrong however to call latitudinarianism. He never lost his sound and simple sight for the main object, the life of Christ proceeding from a supernatural source, but he

thought too highly of this, to compress it into the narrow bounds of a human form, some single tendency or school; he saw in it rather such an inexhaustible depth of sense, as could be in some degree adequately expressed only in an endless variety of gifts, powers, periods and nations. What a difference is there not, for example, between an Origen and a Tertullian, a Chrysostom and an Augustine, a Bernard and a Thomas Aquinas, a Luther and a Melancthon, a Calvin and a Fenelon; or when we go back to the Apostolical Church itself, between a Peter and a John, a James and a Paul, a Martha and a Mary! And yet Neander knew, how to trace out, and greet with joyous gratitude, the same image of Christ variously reflected in all. This will be spoken of more particularly hereafter, when we come to set forth his merits as a church historian; here we notice the wideness of his heart simply as an essential element in his practical piety. Between it and his studies there existed, undoubtedly, a relation of reciprocal encouragement and support. Thus was Neander in the noblest sense the friend of man, because Christ's friend, at home in all spheres of the invisible Church, the exact impression of evangelical catholicity, and an interpreter of the precious doctrine of the communion of the saints, which transcends all limits of time and space, and comprehends all the children of God under the One Head Christ.

Here however must be brought into view a trait, of which indeed his writings furnish only occasional outbreaks for the most part in prefaces, but which in his personal intercourse came to a very marked prominence. Neander's spirit, with all its love and softness, was yet capable also of very strong and decided aversion. This is by no means unpsychological. Hatred in truth is only inverted love. The same force that draws towards it what is in harmony with God, repels from it with equal determination what is of a contrary nature. John, the disciple of love, who lay on Jesus' bosom, was at the same time a son of thunder, who was ready to pray down fire from heaven upon the enemies of his Divine Master, forbade to salute such as should deny the fundamental mystery of the true divinity and humanity of Christ, and according to ancient story forsook a public bath suddenly, when he found that it contained Geronimus the Gnostic heretic. We have often thought, that this apparent contradiction of mildness and harshness, gentleness and holy passion, in the case of the Apostle, who in his Gospel passes by like a still peaceful breeze, while in the Apocalypse he moves with the rushing force of the hurricane or storm, found its solution in Neander, though it is on account of his mildness

only that he has generally been compared with John. It is well known, that the same Neander, who as a historian could do justice to the most different tendencies, and who took even heretics as far as possible into his protection, showed himself impatiently intolerant towards altogether kindred manifestations, when they came before him in *our* time. It is known, that on every opportunity in conversation he expressed his decided antipathy towards two leading forms of thought belonging to the present time; namely, against the *Hegelian philosophy* and *theology* on the one hand, and against the positive or right side of this also in such men as Marheineke, Göschel, Dörner, Martensen, no less than the so called negative *left*, as represented by Baur and Strauss; and then on the other hand against the technical *church orthodoxy*, whether standing in the service of the Union, like Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*, or putting on the form of exclusive Lutheranism, as in the writings of Rudelbach and Guericke.* Here we must take care to distinguish well between right and wrong. Neander saw here two dangerous extremes, which threatened to rob the youth of Germany of the treasure of evangelical freedom and to impose upon it new chains. From the Hegelian philosophy he feared the 'despotism of the spirit; from the strict orthodoxy, the despotism of the letter. He hated the onesided intellectualism and panlogism of the first, the narrow spirit and harsh judgments of the last. There Christianity seemed to him to lose itself in the clouds of idealism, here to fall into stagnation and stiffen into dead forms. Besides he held it altogether vain, to seek the restoration by force of any past period of the Church as such, or to dream of infusing new life again into that which has been once for all judged and set aside

* Of the last I seldom heard him speak, and then only in the most passing way and with contempt—as of an ungrateful copyist, who misused the hard work of other theologians, particularly those belonging to the “United Evangelical Church,” in the service of his ultra-Lutheran dogmatism and fanaticism. The dishonorable dependence of Guericke's *Church History* on the works of Neander, Hase, and others—of his “*Symbolik*” on the copied lectures of Ullmann, (which in the general part, as Ullman himself once told me, he made use of by pages and chapters, almost word for word, without the slightest acknowledgment of the source.)—of his *Introduction* on various books in the same line, used but not quoted, among others Gerlach's *N. T.*, &c.—is something well known; and would not be noticed here at all, had not an English Quarterly in this country, for which otherwise we have only the best wishes, in repeated instances, with well meaning ignorance, praised this same Guericke, as one of the greatest if not the very first among the scholars of Germany, and as a model theologian worthy of universal study!!

by the course of history. We honor now the motives which lay at the bottom of this whole view ; and as regards his opposition to the left side of the Hegelian school, we are of one mind with it entirely. For this modern Gnoeticism represents the perfection of scientific unbelief, denies the existence of a personal God, the self-conscious duration of man after death, treats the Gospels as a book of fables, declares most of the N. T. writings to have been produced by the pious fraud of the period after the Apostles, and dissolves all christian ideas, so far as it has any left, into the creations of a philosophy that ends in pure mist and smoke. Against this arrogant pantheism, different from atheism only in form, this lifeless formalism of the understanding, that destroys at last all soul in man, and turns him into a pure speculator on the open heath, an unfruitful thinker of thinking, a heartless critic and fault finder, Neander has often in private conversation entered his vigorous protest, asserting the authority of the Bible doctrine concerning God, and the claims of our common life, which can never possibly be satisfied by such dialectical play though it be never so brilliant. And it is only to be wished indeed, that he had taken occasion in a public way, to assail much more sharply than he has done in fact, in his *Life of Christ* for instance the purely negative special pleading of the mythologist Dr. Strauss, and in his *Age of the Apostles* also the altogether similar proceeding of Baur, Schwegler and Zeller, with the Acts of the Apostles and the N. Testament Epistles. As regards however the positive christian speculation which has leaned more or less on the Hegelian philosophy, he certainly carried his opposition too far, although we may well admire his sense for the simple, sound and natural, which often lay at the bottom of it. There was much no doubt to object to in the various attempts of a Göschel, a Marheineke, &c., to unite Hegel's philosophy with biblical christianity and church orthodoxy, much that was sickly and false ; but still the necessity of a speculative theology, aiming to satisfy the highest requirements of reason, lies deep in the process of Protestantism itself, and many of the best and most gifted men, (think only for example of Daub, Dörner, Rothe.) have devoted and still devote their noblest powers to this great problem, the reconciliation of reason with revelation, not despising in such task the help of this profound and comprehensive thinker, who may well be styled the German Aristotle. Neander had the less cause to denounce root and branch the Hegelian philosophy, with all belonging to it directly or indirectly, as he himself in one most weighty point fell in with it, namely in the idea of *development*,

VOL. III.—NO. I. 6 •

which lies at the foundation of his Church History, while it forms (though indeed in very different logico-dialectical shape,) the very life blood of Hegel's system. Thus decidedly unjust towards Hegel and his disciples, he allowed himself on the other hand to be greatly carried away with the sanguine hopes, which were fixed on the coming forward of Schelling in Berlin with his "positive" philosophy, as it was called—hopes that have been since but very partially fulfilled. Just as little finally can we approve his harsh judgment upon the revival of the strong church tendency, by which he brought dissension unnecessarily into the ranks of the friends of revelation, and without meaning it placed in the hands of the Rationalists a welcome weapon against the cause of truth. Who will deny, that especially in a time so distracted and unsettled as ours, this revival of the symbolical theology had full right and weighty reason, though we agree with Neander of course in the view, that the present has a far more comprehensive task to fulfil than simply to restore again out and out the church relations of the 16th century, a thing at all events that can never be done. Neander moreover could not but know, that in the most essential points of faith he was himself of one mind with those champions of church orthodoxy, and differed from them properly only in scientific form and range of vision. The more unfair has it appeared to us for this reason, that whilst he showed a certain toleration even towards Dr. Strauss in his well known judgment on the prohibition of his infamous "*Leben Jesu*," he should have held himself almost entirely aloof from his colleague Hengstenberg, a man who has borne so much of the reproach of Christ, and that to the deep grief of the pious in Berlin he renounced at last formally and publicly all connection whatever with the "*Evangelical Church Journal*," on account especially of its undue severity towards the cherished memory of his great friend Schleiermacher. They were men indeed of altogether different nature, but yet not more so than for instance Melancthon and Calvin, who notwithstanding honored and loved one another as brothers.

At all events, think of these theological tendencies themselves as we may, the manner and style in which Neander was accustomed to assail them, in his evening circles particularly, urged on often by slavishly devoted students, was by no means free from morbid irritation and passion; an infirmity suited to keep the admiration of his friends from running into actual man worship.

The weakness of a great and good man goes only to show, that the highest human virtue is imperfect, and that we all need mercy and intercession. This fact was well understood by the

humble Neander himself, who in addressing his pupils from his window, on the last anniversary of his birth but one, poured forth publicly a confession of his own sinfulness that moved every heart.

Aside however from the strong and invincible prejudices now mentioned, it was not easy indeed to detect in him a single fault; he presented on the contrary a combination of the noblest qualities and fairest virtues, refined by the spirit of Christianity, such as is rarely indeed met with in a single man. The leading features of his character were *simplicity, honesty, disinterestedness, humility, love*. Of the plots and intrigues, the manifold duplicities and crafty calculations of worldly men, he had hardly a conception even by hearsay; his noble Nathanael spirit lay clear and open before God and man, like the simplicity of the dove itself. He gave his confidence to every body, and was thus indeed often enough deceived. Great as his the retic knowledge of men was, he erred continually in the application of it to particular actual cases, and this from sheer goodness of heart and childlike simplicity. To understand and admire in its true living force that great word of the Redeemer, *Except ye become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*, it was only necessary to become acquainted with Neander.— He was in very truth a child in malice, and yet at the same time a giant in understanding. In our whole life we have never met, among learned men, with spirits more childlike and amiable than those of Neander and the pious naturalist and traveller G. H. von Schubert of Munich. And who does not admire the noble and conscientious regard for truth, which appears in all Neander's scientific investigations, not excepting those even in which his views whether right or wrong were found to deviate from the older orthodoxy. His disinterestedness was, we may well say, without bounds. He had indeed for his own person externally few wants; his clothing was of the most simple sort; his moderation in eating and drinking reminded one of the lives of the old ascetics, and of St. Anthony, who felt ashamed as an immortal spirit of having to use earthly food. By reason of his unpractical nature moreover, and his total abstraction from the world, he was indeed wholly ignorant of the value of money, and had not his sister relieved him from taking care of it, he would no doubt have brought himself to beggary over and over again by sheer benevolence. In this respect also he showed not a trace of his Jewish descent. It is known that the university teachers in Germany receive apart of their remuneration from the students who have for this purpose to pay over a fixed sum

for every course to the treasurer. To get a remission of this honorarium from Neander was the easiest thing in the world, and he was very often imposed on here by those who were anything but poor. The Society for Sick Students in Berlin owed its origin to him, and he devoted to it the whole profits of several of his writings; as he gave also all that he got for another part of his works to Bible Societies, for the circulation of bibles among the heathen. Every one in want or need found with him a sympathizing heart and liberal hand. We have still a very lively remembrance of his heartfelt interest for a young man who was blind. Earnestly thirsting after religious knowledge, the youth had attended several of his lectures in 1840-41 on church history and exegesis, and spoke afterwards with the most grateful satisfaction of the spiritual benefit they had afforded him. When Neander heard of his necessitous circumstances, he showed the greatest emotion, inquired with staring eyes and growing agitation into all the details, and then hurried away to his sister to procure him help. We happened to be in his study at the time, and the scene struck us the more deeply, as Neander, by reason of his total lack of practical tact, had himself the air of one perfectly helpless, and with the greatest readiness to assist want was still in a perfect quandary as to how it should be done, till his sister or some student came to his relief. And how much good did he not do, which only eternity will bring to light! For he was the man precisely and in full, to abhor all show and not to let the right hand know what was done by the left. No doubt he possessed naturally in high degree what we call a good heart; but it was lifted into the region of grace, and seasoned and sanctified by the love of Christ, the Saviour of the world. Of sexual love he knew nothing; and yet how highly he conceived of the dignity and worth of woman; how beautifully he has portrayed the blessed influence of pious mothers upon the religious history of several of the greatest church fathers, such as Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom and Augustine; how tenderly devoted was he towards his sisters, especially to that one who gave herself up to the care of his earthly wants, that his rich mind might be consecrated to the undisturbed service of the Church! Sons and daughters were denied him; but this privation was made up to him in his students, for whom he had the feelings of a real father. Never perhaps was the love of a professor towards theological youth so inward and strong. No wonder, that they were enthusiastically devoted to him also in return. As often as his birth day came round, they brought him some suitable present and a serenade,

to which was added not unfrequently a grand torch-light procession; not only his own immediate pupils, but hundreds of students also from the other faculties, joining with lively interest in the occasion. And as he was ready to serve every German youth, so had he a warm welcome also for every foreigner, who visited him as a theologian or as a friend of the kingdom of God. In France, England, Scotland, and America, there are to be found many very worthy ministers, who have experienced his kindness and hospitality and hold them still in thankful remembrance. Through such visits, where his familiarity with the French and English languages did him excellent service, he has scattered many a noble seed into distant lands, which has since sprung up in quiet stillness and is now yielding fruit a hundred fold. For Americans he had a certain partiality, as a free course of the religious life, undisturbed by any sort of political influence, fell in specially with his taste; although of course the division and distraction of the Church in this country was not approved by him, and near at hand would have been still more deplored than as seen only at so great a distance. For he was emphatically a man for union, and sought the one in the manifold no less than the manifold in the one.

This glorious character, thus full of childlike simplicity, tender conscientiousness, unwearied professional fidelity, and warm self-sacrificing love, this life thus wholly consecrated to the highest ends of the spirit, the advancement of truth and piety, was rooted and secured throughout in the grace of *humility*. Neander knew the deep corruption of human nature, the absolute necessity of its redemption in Christ, placed himself cheerfully in the great concern of life by the side of the least; with all his uncommon learning preferred the simple unadorned preaching of the gospel for poor sinners to the most brilliant displays of rhetorical talent; listened on Sunday with touching attention and devotion to the foolishness of the cross, which yet puts to shame all the wisdom of this world; and with all his immense popularity, and his fame spread over the whole theological world, never allowed himself to be blinded by pride and vanity, or to swerve the breadth of a finger even from the track of that virtue which Chrysostom styles the foundation of all christian morality; he remained to the last breath as simple and humble as a child, and would be nothing in himself, but all only in and through Christ. One of his favorite mottoes, which he wrote for us in our album, was, *Theologia crucis, non gloriæ*; and according to this he himself lived, spoke, and wrote, till life's frail tenement gave way and his spirit passed into the full vision of the crucified One in glory.

Neander had always a weak and sickly body. In the last years of his life however, he became in a very peculiar sense a theologian of the cross, with painful experience that the *via lucis* is indeed also a *via crucis*. By a dark though gracious dispensation of the Lord, he was doomed, like the illustrious author of the *Paradise Lost*, to an almost total loss of sight, long before weakened by incessant study day and night—a doubly severe trial for a scholar, and particularly for a historian, to whom no organ is in any degree so valuable and necessary as his eyes. Thus must this friend of God be perfected by suffering. His faith gave him power to bear also this calamity, and to him might be applied in full measure what St. Anthony once said to the blind church teacher, Didymus of Alexandria: "Let it not trouble thee to be without the eyes with which even flies can see; but rejoice rather that thou hast the eyes that angels see with, for the vision of God and his blessed light." Not a murmur, not a sound of complaint or discontent, passed over Neander's lips; and in this way the crown was set upon his character by *patience* and quiet *resignation* to God's will. He did not suffer himself to be interrupted in his work by this affliction, and showed in it a rare power of will over opposing nature. Not only did he continue to hold his lectures as before with the most conscientious fidelity, but he went forward unceasingly also in his literary labors with the help of a reader and amanuensis. Nay, he took part even so late as the beginning of the year 1850, in connection with Dr. Julius Müller of Halle and Dr. Nitzsch of Berlin, in establishing a new periodical, the valuable "*Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben*;" and furnished for it a number of excellent articles, such as a retrospect of the first half of this century, one on the difference between the Hellenic and Christian Ethics, another on the practical exposition of the Bible—in which he still soared with unabated strength like an eagle, only a short time before his death.

What his departed friend Schleiermacher had wished for himself already in his "Monologues," and afterwards actually received, was granted also to Neander, the privilege namely of dying in the full possession of his mental powers and in the midst of his work. Only eight days before his death, on the occasion of a visit from Gutzlaff, "the apostle of the Chinese," he made an address with youthful freshness on the Chinese Mission, and looked forward with animation to the future triumphs of the kingdom of God, the setting forth of whose growth, under the guidance of the twofold likeness of the mustard seed

and heaven, he considered the great business of his own life. On the following Monday, the 8th of July, he delivered his last lecture, in the midst of severe pains from an attack of something like cholera, so that his voice several times failed, and he was scarcely able with the help of some of the students to come down the steps of the rostrum. But notwithstanding this, immediately after dinner which he hardly touched, he set himself again to dictating for the last volume of his Church History, which was to describe the close of the Middle Ages and the preparation for the Reformation, until nature violently kept down asserted in the end her rights, and fastened him to his bed. Then he had his last and severest trial to endure, in ceasing to work for the kingdom of God, which had always been his life and highest joy. Several times indeed he wanted to gather himself up again, and to put force on his sinking body, and became almost impatient when the physician refused to allow it. But his affectionate sister now reminded him of what he used to say to her in sickness, to engage her submission to medical judgment: "It comes from God—therefore must we suit ourselves to it cheerfully." Calmed at once, and as it were ashamed, he replied: "That is true, dear Hannah, it all comes from God, and we must thank him for it." So formerly the great bishop, Chrysostom, whose life and deeds Neander had delighted to portray, expired in banishment with the exclamation, "God be praised for all!" Still however only a few hours before his dissolution, on Saturday afternoon, the "father of modern church history" once more collected his strength, and taking up the thread of his unfinished work just where he had left off before, dictated a description of the differences among the so-called "Friends of God," those remarkable German Mystics of the 14th and 15th centuries, who with so many other revelations of that transition period, not unlike our own, prepared the way both negatively and positively for the Reformation and its Protestant results. After this worthy conclusion of his literary activity, about half past nine o'clock, he longed for rest, and in a sort of half dream, as at the end of a toilsome journey, addressed his sister with the significant words: "*I am weary, let us go home!*" When the bed had been put in order by a friendly hand for his last slumber, he threw the whole tenderness and affection of his nature once again into a scarcely audible "*Good night*;" slept then for four hours, breathing always more softly and slowly; and with the morning of the Lord's day, on what is styled in the church year the Sunday of Refreshing, awoke in the morning of eternity among the spirits of the just made perfect. There;

in the midst of his favorite kindred minds, Melancthon, Bernard, Anselm, Chrysostom, Augustine, and St. John, he rests now from all labor, in blissful joy, on the breast of him whom not having seen, he here loved, feasting his eyes with that glory of which all earthly beauty is but a dim shadow.

But as for us, who remain bound to the earth and are called to work and wrestle still amid the tumultuating growing confusion of the church militant, we can only pray in humility, that it may please the Lord soon to bring in that *Johannean Age*, of which the sainted Neander, the "Præceptor Germaniæ" so often prophetically spoke, the age of love, of peace, in which all the past contradictions of the Church shall be reduced to harmony and order, when every knee in heaven or on earth or under the earth shall bow to him, and all who love Christ shall join with one heart and mouth in praising the Triune God.

It will be perceived that this very imperfect sketch rests upon something more than a mere literary interest in Neander. The writer did not belong indeed to the more intimate circle of his disciples and followers. When my acquaintance with him commenced, I had already nearly completed my theological studies, under wholly different influences in part, at Tübingen and Halle, and my attendance on his lectures was limited to the third part simply of his course in church history, reaching from the Reformation down to the present time. The relation besides in which I stood to speculative theology and church orthodoxy, was not exactly what he could approve. The first I then held, and still hold, to be highly necessary, for the full solution of certain great problems of the present time, particularly the christological question, or at least for bringing them nearer to their final solution; the second I regard not merely as a barrier to the destructive tendencies of unbelief, but as a wholesome counterpoise also to that on-sided subjectivity, which is the fault of our modern Protestantism generally. If the later evangelical theology then, among whose founders Schleiermacher must be allowed at least to hold a prominent place, is ever to accomplish its mission, it may never renounce connection with the faith of the fathers, and it must show itself also in the widest sense practical and churchly; that is it must lead to a new construction of the general life of the Church, in which shall be happily united and preserved the results of all earlier history, the bloom and fruit of the past both Protestant and Catholic. Notwithstanding these differences however, which touch not indeed the substance of chris-

tion faith, Neander always treated me, as a student, and in the exercises connected with the taking of my degree, and afterwards as *privatdocent*, with the greatest friendship and with a love I may say which was truly paternal. He was ever ready to direct and assist me in my studies. It was my privilege to spend many precious hours, partly alone with him in his study and partly at his dinner table, to which his particular friends were so often invited; and I count it a special favor of the Lord, that he permitted me to come so closely to such a theologian, in whom learning and piety were so harmoniously blended, and from whose frail body the life of Jesus Christ was reflected with such unearthly beauty, and to impress upon my memory his beloved image, as a powerful monition to simplicity, to gentleness, to humility, to love, and to a heavenly mind. When accordingly in the year 1843, partly by Neander's recommendation, I was called altogether unexpectedly to Mercersburg, he gave me at parting his warm shake of the hand, his hearty benediction, which I cannot call to mind without grateful emotion. And although my situation since has of necessity brought me into relation negatively and positively with the Anglo-American theology and religion, and I have accustomed myself to look at the history both of the world and of the church, so to speak, from the American or more correctly from the Anglo-German stand point; I have still continued in almost daily connection with Neander's works, and have learned from them, particularly as regards the patristic period, more than from any other historian. When I made up my mind accordingly a year and a half since to publish my own Church History, I held it a simple duty of gratitude to dedicate the first volume to my venerated teacher and fatherly friend, and applied to him before hand for permission to use his name in this way. In reply, though then already nearly blind, with his own trembling hand and in almost illegible characters, he wrote me a letter, which I subjoin here in conclusion, as being one of the last probably that flowed from his pen, and because besides it contains a remarkable judgment on the events of the year 1848, the crisis of the existing European culture, and in this respect also may not be without interest for his numerous friends and pupils.

Mercersburg, Pa.

P. S.

"MY DEAR FRIEND:

"I can only return you my hearty thanks for the testimony you publicly offer me of your affectionate remembrance, and for the honor you propose to show me,

whilst I desire for you in your work all illumination and strength from on high.

"As regards your Journal, I believe something of it through your kindness has reached me, for which you have my hearty thanks. It is well, that you have reminded me of it. I may now easily forget anything, and let it lie unused, as I can read only through other people's eyes, having suffered for two years past from the consequences of a paralysis settled in my own.

"I had intended to send you along with this letter something new of my publications; but it is now omitted, as it just so happens that all my copies have already been given away. If the good Lord had not visited me with weakness in my eyes, I would have had the pleasure long since of being able to send you a new volume of the Church History as far as to the Reformation, and perhaps by this time even the history of the Reformation itself.

"What men called freedom in our poor fatherland, during the mournful year 1848, is something very different from what is sought and meant by the spirit which has been born from the best English piety in your America. It was a conflict here between *atheism and Christianity*, between *vandalism and true civilization*. Even many years ago I predicted, that the philosophy of onesided logic, intellectual fanaticism and self deification, must lead to this proper consequence of its fictions, as by their popularization has now come to pass. Not as though this philosophy alone were in fault; but it was the most strictly consequent scientific expression of the reigning spirit of the age and its tendency. Nor will I deny that there are true wants also at hand in the spirit of the age, and that nothing short of their satisfaction, which the gospel alone has power to secure, can bring any lasting relief. *We stand on the brink of an abyss, the downfall of the old European culture, or else on the confines of a new moral creation, to be ushered in through manifold storms, another grand act in the world-transforming process of Christianity.* In the mercy of a long-suffering God we will hope for the last.

"Praying that God's richest blessing may rest on your family, on your work and all that pertains to you, I remain

Affectionately yours,

Berlin, 28th Oct., 1849."

A. NEANDER."

SONNETS.

I.

'TWIXT leafy boughs of oaks, which bending threw
From their wide skirts into a narrow dell
Dim shadows, a few sunbeams slid and fell
On a fair flower, a lovelier never grew,
In rocky niche, like modest virgin, seen,
Or like the Naiad of the silver brook
Making sweet music in that hidden nook,
Or like a statue of the Fairy Queen;
And yet unlike a statue, for a breeze
Lifts gently its fair head, and see below
The mirrored form where smooth the waters flow.
A maid perchance there is, who lives to please
As me that rarest flower, an only one;
Pity it were if she would die a nun.

II.

From this high hill as sinks the sun behind
Yon mountain-ridge, and solemn night descends
On valley, stream, and forest; as she rends
The veil that hides infinity, my mind
Mounts up in worship to the silent stars.
In such a temple olden prophets bowed
Far from the noises of the earthly crowd,
Sick of their blindness and perpetual woes,
Rapt in their visions, while the horned moon,
By Hesperus attended, slow withdrew,
Nor feared the falling of the drops of dew
Nor sprites, nor eyes of fire, nor echoing tune
Of woodland chirpers.—In a holy place
The troops of evil durst not show their face.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

EUTHANASIA.

OVER the sea-green belt on the horizon
 After the sun went down, a flock of clouds,
 Some dark with fiery skirts, and fleecy some,
 Purple and golden, drifted from the west
 Up the blue concave. In the lake beneath,
 Where the broad shadow of the mountain fell,
 They multiplied their glory, and 'mid rock-
 And oaks, and flowers, that lined the southern shore
 Th' unsteady waters threw a mellow glow.
 And there beside a cliff, crested with pines,
 Under a crab-tree, whose sweet blooms the bee
 And wanton wind dispersed, an aged man
 Of mild and thoughtful air, his hoary locks
 Loose waving, sat, as held by strong enchantment.
 At length, in voice of quaintest melody,
 He sang of one he knew in life's gay morn.

Dreams of my youth return ;
 Brightly the sun-rays
 Dance on the running stream,
 Spotted with foam-flakes.

Violets and narcissi
 Grow up side by side,
 Sisters in beauty, they
 Stand on the green bank.

Fairest of all, her eyes
 Drink in the vision,
 Filling her gentle soul
 With its own splendor.

Thus is her spirit fed
 Till too pure for earth—
 Angels' wings in the light
 Of Heaven-gate, like a dove's

Gleam, and immortal Love,
 Soft as a moon beam,
 Enters the happy breast
 Of Rotha, the blue-eyed.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

ANGELS.

It may seem a consideration of force against the angelophanies of the Bible, that nothing of the sort is known or heard of in the modern world. Like the apparitions of spirits generally, they appear to have fled before the light of cultivation and science. It ought not to be overlooked however, that the angels of the Old Testament attend only special occasions, the opening as it were of new acts, in the drama of revelation. Now the modern world is indeed a deep, broad, mighty stream; but it is still a stream in its settled and regular course; only issuing from the miraculous period of Christ's incarnation. The angelophanies which took place at his grave ushered in our æon, which will now last to the end of the world. Then, we are told (Matth. xiii: 39), the angels will again make their appearance among men. Account must be taken besides of the peculiar nature of this christian æon. Christ has appeared, and the believing christian world has been brought to see his glory by his Spirit. The old christological longing thus is satisfied, and the element of angelic visions lost we may say in the presence of this higher light. In this respect, the angels may be compared with the stars of heaven; they vanish with the rising sun; even the full moon becomes at mid-day but as a pale fleecy cloud.

The possibility of such beings as the angels of holy Writ, is continually more and more confirmed by modern natural science. There on high, stars of endlessly diversified hue and form roll through the boundless fields of space; many of them ethereally light as golden dreams, like floating orbs of spirit. The dwellers in them must be answerable to their sylph-like nature, in fineness of organization and freedom of movement. For philosophers indeed who see in the whole starry heavens only "rocks of light," or uninhabited deserts, the whole universe is but an Ahriman, a world shut up and dark for mind. But if the heavens are really inhabited, as the analogy of our own earth authorises us to believe, they must be regarded of course as a vast boundless region of spirits. In this boundless range are to be found the ministering spirits, which are spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews certainly as having an objective or real existence. To conceive however of their apparition objectively, we must take into view the preparation of the subject inwardly for being favored with such vision.

In the night, streams can be heard afar off, whose sound amid

the tumult of day was not perceived. The light from a distant hut becomes conspicuous over a whole region, where by day the hut itself on fire would hardly be noticed. The thunder of Niagara is said to be more felt at a certain distance, than in the immediate neighborhood of the rushing cataract. The same difference holds in the sphere of the inner life. Most souls are unceasingly filled with the noise of the outward actual world, led captive by it and bound. Their eyes can hardly discern simple greatness or beauty, when it is made to pass before them in bodily form; for they seek the single only in the midst of the manifold, and give themselves up entirely to the whirl and tumult with which they are surrounded. When however this spirit has taken demoniacal possession of an age, or has become even its worship, we need not wonder at the total failure of that deep sense, which feels and owns the travelling of spirits from star to star or from heaven to earth. When one has set himself down in the mill of a world-seeking selfishness, with all its wheels in full roll, he hears not the fall of Niagara itself—though outwardly close at hand.

But there are souls on the other hand, which possess a higher and more active sense for the infinite, because they have courage from God to let the distractions of earth pass by them as something foreign from their own life. Their inward frame leads them even to see in the outward course of the world, its approaching dissolution and end. It lies however in the nature of the case, that one for whom the world is thus turned to shadow, should at the same time win an organ, or rather have one unfolded within him, by which he may see into heaven, and become sensible of heavenly impressions. When an old form of the world is ready to fall, and a new one from heaven is expected to take its place, the noblest minds are found to be so to speak vacant, or more properly open for what is from above—no more occupied with the old world, which with its noise and show has become for them as it were dead. In this state, they can hear spirit voices and see the angels of God. In such frame the women of the gospel came to the grave of Jesus; for them all the glory of the world lay in its bosom. They had for this reason an open eye, the inward vision of seers, for the heavenly messengers. So was it also with the sight bestowed upon the disciples on the Mount of Olives, when Christ left them for heaven. The earth for them dissolved into nothing, as their Master was taken from their side; and now they could see the messengers from on high, and understand their message.

Translated from J. P. Lange.

THE FOOT-PRINTS OF THE CREATOR.

The Foot-prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepsis of Stromness, by Hugh Miller, author of "The Old Red Sandstone," with a memoir of the author, by Lewis Agassiz. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Boston. 1850: pp. 337.

MR. MILLER is a native of Scotland, and editor of the *Edinburgh Witness*, the chief newspaper of the Free Church. From the humble condition of a stone-cutter in the quarries of Cromarty, where his attention was first drawn to the study of fossil remains, he has risen, by the force of genius, to an eminent rank among the geologists of our time. His writings are characterized by freshness, clearness and brilliance of style, as well as by depth and vigor of thought.

The present volume is doubtless named, "The Foot-prints of the Creator," because it stands out in bold contrast and opposition to the "Vestiges of Creation,"—a work, which, tending, as it does, to destroy all belief in the existence of a personal God, has wrought vast mischief in minds of a certain order, both in this country and in Europe, either by undermining the foundations of faith, or by strengthening the common religious prejudice (already too strong) against the revelations of palæontology. The Lamarckian hypothesis of development receives no quarter at the hands of Mr. Miller. He considers it as a dream of vain philosophy—a specious theory, that had its birth, in substance, as long ago as Epicurus, and yet proceeds to overthrow it quietly, by a rigid induction of facts, obtained by years of patient toil and now brought forth and exhibited in a manner so skillful and ingenious as to excite universal admiration. A few more such onsets, and every one, who at all values his reputation as a man of science, will be ashamed to trace his own history in the monad, vesicle, or *les petits gelatineux* of the primeval oceans travelling, during immense cycles of ages, by gradual and successive transformations, through the whole range of the radiates, mollusks, articulates, and vertebrates, each new want, of its own accord, creating a new organ and producing a new species, until it end at last in the ape as his immediate predecessor. Mr. Miller has done essential service to the cause of truth and progress by demonstrating that this theory has no real scientific ground on which to rest. To all, who feel any interest in the subject, we heartily recommend his book, as the work of a christian and a philosopher.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

THE POETRY OF SCIENCE.

The Poetry of Science, by Robert Hunt, author of 'Panthea,' 'Researches on Light,' etc. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln.—Boston. 1850: pp. 388.

"THE poetry of Science!" and is there poetry in Science? Can mud be transmuted into gold, or homespun into robes of purple? That were indeed a miracle beyond the reach of art. Such is the opinion of the great mass of unthinking men. But the world has too long been accustomed to look upon the results of scientific labor as mere dry details of facts. The day is rapidly approaching when Truth in her own severe simplicity will be found to possess charms to attract the lover of the beautiful far more potent than the half-formed and incongruous creations of untutored Fancy—when the poet and the child of genius will make pilgrimages to the wells of Science and drink inspiration from waters purer than those of Castalia. In the delightful volume before us we have an earnest of what is yet to be done. Availing himself of the most recent discoveries in Natural Philosophy and Chemistry, Mr. Hunt has produced a work, the perusal of which must afford the highest gratification to every reader of intelligence and taste. It deserves a wide circulation.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MARCH, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. II.

THE OLD PALATINATE LITURGY OF 1563.

(Continued from Vol. II. No. III.)

Of the Holy Supper of our Lord.

ON those days on which the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated, the minister shall direct his sermon as much as possible to the subsequent service, and study brevity. After the sermon, and the public confession of sin and prayer, the following exhortation shall be read slowly and intelligibly, with emphasis and earnestness, at the table around which the supper is to be celebrated.

Form for the administration of the Holy Supper.

Institution of the
Lord's Supper according
to St. Paul.

} *Beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ:* Attend to the words of the institution of the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, recorded by the Holy Apostle Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, the 11th chap: "For I have received of the Lord, that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said: 'Take eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.' After

VOL. III.—NO. II.

the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying: 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death, till He come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

That we now may celebrate the supper of the Lord to our comfort it is above all things necessary that we rightly examine ourselves; and in the next place that we direct it to that end, for which the Lord Jesus appointed it, namely the remembrance of Him.

1. Acknowledg- } Sincere self-examination consists of these
 ment of sin. } three parts: In *the first place* that every one solemnly consider the greatness of his sins and condemnation, so as to abhor and humble himself before God; remembering that the wrath of God against sin is so great, that rather than suffer it to go unpunished, He hath punished the same in His beloved Son Jesus Christ, with the bitter and shameful death of the cross.

2. Faith in } In *the next place*, let every one examine his
 Jesus Christ. } heart, and see whether he really believes the certain promise of God, that all his sins are forgiven, alone for the sake of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ; and that the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed and freely granted unto him as his own, as though he had himself made satisfaction for all his sins in his own person, and fulfilled all righteousness.

3. Pious purpose } In *the third place*, let every one search
 to lead a holy life. } his conscience, whether he is sincerely resolved, henceforth, with his whole life, to prove his gratitude to God, and to walk uprightly before Him. And also whether he unfeignedly and heartily renounces all enmity, envy, and hatred, and has determined henceforth to live in true love and peace with his fellowmen.

As many therefore as are thus reminded, may feel assured that God will receive them in mercy, and acknowledge them as worthy guests of His Son Jesus Christ.

Warning against } Those on the contrary who have not this
 impenitent sinners. } testimony of a good conscience, eat and drink judgment to themselves. Wherefore, according to the command of Christ and the Apostle Paul, we admonish all to

abstain from the table of the Lord, who know themselves to be guilty of the following sins, and declare unto them that they have no part in the kingdom of Jesus Christ: All idolaters; all who invoke deceased saints, angels, or other creatures; worshippers of images; enchanterers or diviners, using enchantments with cattle, mankind, or other things, and such as trust in those charms; all despisers of God, of His word, or the holy sacraments; blasphemers; schismatics and those who excite sedition in Church or State; perjurers; all such as are disobedient to their parents and superiors; all murderers, contentious and quarrelsome persons, who live in envy and hatred with their neighbors; adulterers, whoremongers, drunkards, thieves, usurers, robbers, gamesters, misers, and all who lead a scandalous life. These all, as long as they persist in such sins, must consider themselves excluded from partaking of this holy supper, and abstain therefrom, lest their judgment and damnation be more severe.

Weak, penitent believers, not to be discouraged.

} But this is not said, Beloved in the Lord, to discourage contrite believers, as though none might join in the supper of the Lord,

but such as are sinless. For we do not celebrate this supper, to show thereby that we are perfect and righteous in ourselves. On the contrary, by thus seeking our life and salvation out of ourselves, in Jesus Christ, we confess ourselves to be in the bonds of spiritual death. For we still discover many infirmities and miseries in our lives, knowing that our faith is weak and imperfect, and that we do not serve the Lord with becoming zeal, but have daily to fight with the infirmities of our faith, and the corrupt lusts of the flesh. But by the grace of the Holy Spirit, we heartily deplore these infirmities, contend against our unbelief, and sincerely desire to live according to all the commandments of God. Wherefore we may feel certainly assured, that no sin or infirmity, which may yet cleave unto us, against our will, shall hinder our gracious acceptance with God, or our worthy and profitable participation in this heavenly meat and drink.

II. The design of the Lord's Supper.

} Let us now, *in the next place*, consider to what end the Lord instituted His supper, namely that we do this in remembrance of Him.

1. For the confirmation of our faith.

} *We are to remember Him*, in the first place, by certainly believing, in our hearts, that our Lord Jesus Christ was sent into the world, by the Father, according to the promise made in the beginning unto our forefathers; that He took upon Himself our flesh and blood; that He endured for us the wrath of God, under which we must

eternally have perished, from His incarnation until the end of His life on earth, and rendered complete obedience unto the divine law, fulfilling all righteousness for us. But especially are we to believe that all this was done, when under the burden of our sins, and the wrath of God, He sweat great drops as it were of blood in the garden; when He was bound, that we might be released; when He then endured inexpressible reproach, that we might never be put to shame; was condemned to death, that we might be acquitted at the judgment-seat of God; and above all when He permitted His sacred body to be nailed to the cross, that He might fasten thereon the indictment of our sins; and so assumed our condemnation, that He might replenish us with His saving grace, abasing Himself into the deepest reproach and hellish anguish of body and soul, on the cross, when He cried out with a loud voice: 'My God! My God! Why has Thou forsaken me?' That He suffered all this in order that we might find acceptance with God, and never be forsaken, sealing the new and everlasting Testament, the covenant of grace and reconciliation, with the shedding of His blood, and with His death, when He finally said, 'It is finished.'

That we now might firmly believe, that we have part in this covenant, Our Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, take and eat, this is my body which is offered for you; do this in remembrance of me.

In like manner also, after supper, He took the cup, blessed it, and gave it unto them, saying: Drink ye all of it, this cup is the New Testament in my blood, shed for you and for many, for the forgiveness of sins; do this as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. That is, as oft as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall be reminded and assured, as by a certain remembrance and pledge, of this my hearty love and faithfulness unto you, who must have perished with everlasting death, had I not given my body to die for you upon the cross, and shed my blood to feed and nourish your hungry and thirsty souls with this same crucified body and shed blood, as certainly as you all see this bread broken, and this cup handed unto you, and you are permitted to eat and drink thereof with your mouth, in remembrance of Me.

From this institution of the holy supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, we see that He fixes our faith and confidence upon His perfect sacrifice, once offered upon the cross, as upon the only foundation and basis of our salvation, having Himself become the true meat and drink of eternal life unto our hungry and thirsty souls.

For by His death He hath removed the cause of our hunger and grief, namely sin, and procured for us the quickening Spirit, that we, through the same Spirit, dwelling in Christ as the head, and in us as His members, may have true fellowship with Him, and be made partakers of all His benefits, of eternal life, righteousness and glory.

2. For the furtherance } *Another design of this Holy Supper is,*
of brotherly love. } that by the same Spirit, we may all be knit together, as members of one body, in true brotherly love; as the Holy Apostle Paul saith: *For as it is one bread, so we being many are one body, forasmuch as we are all partakers of one bread.* For as out of many grains one meal is ground, and one bread is baked, and out of many berries pressed together one wine and one drink floweth and commingleth; so also shall we all, being incorporated with Christ by true faith, be one body through brotherly love, for the sake of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath first so loved us; and that not in word only, but in very deed. And hereunto may the Almighty and Merciful God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ help us by His Holy Spirit. Amen.

Let us Pray.

Prayer before the communion for true faith, sanctification and steadfastness in the cross. } Most Merciful God and Father, we beseech Thee, that in this holy supper, in which we celebrate the glorious remembrance of the bitter death of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, Thou wouldest so operate upon our hearts by Thy Holy Spirit, that we may surrender ourselves continually more and more, with true faith, unto Thy Son Jesus Christ, that our heavy-laden and contrite hearts may be nourished and quickened with His true body and blood, yea with Him, as true God and man, the only heavenly bread, by the power of the Holy Ghost. And thus may we no more live in sin, but He in us and we in Him, and be made so really to partake of the blessings of the eternal Testament and covenant of grace, that we may never doubt that Thou wilt be our Father forever, no more reckoning our sins against us, but providing all things for us, for soul and body, as Thy dear children, and heirs.

Grant unto us also Thy grace, that we may cheerfully bear our cross, deny ourselves, confess our Saviour, and in all our tribulations, with uplifted heads, expect our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, when He will make our mortal bodies like unto

His glorified and glorious body, and receive us with Himself into eternal life. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, &c. Amen.

Confirm us also, by this holy supper, in the catholic, undoubted christian faith, of which we make confession with heart and mouth, saying :

I believe in God, &c. Amen.

And now, Beloved in the Lord, that we may be fed with the true heavenly bread, Jesus Christ, let us not permit our hearts to cleave unto this external bread and wine, but lift them up in faith unto heaven, where Jesus Christ our advocate sitteth at the right hand of His heavenly Father, whither also the articles of our Christian faith direct us, not doubting that our souls shall be fed with His body and blood, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, as certainly as we receive the sacred bread and wine in remembrance of Him.

(The minister shall now exhort the communicants to approach the table of the Lord with becoming order and seriousness, publicly to confess and confirm their faith, and then he shall break the bread of the Lord and place it in each one's hand, saying :)

The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ.

(The other minister in presenting the cup shall say :)

The cup of blessing which we bless, is the communion of the blood of Christ.

(The administration of the communion being completed, the minister shall say :)

Beloved in the Lord, Inasmuch as the Lord hath now fed our souls at His table, let us praise His name with united thanksgiving, each one saying in his heart :

Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits : Who forgiveth all thine iniquities ; who healeth all thy diseases ; who redeemeth thy life from destruction ; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies. The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide : neither will He keep His anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins ; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us. As a father pitieth His children, so the

Lord pitieth them that love Him. Who hath not spared His own Son, but hath delivered Him up for us all : wherefore should He not with Him also freely give us all things. Wherefore God sheweth His love toward us, in that while we were sinners Christ died for us. Much more then being justified by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath, through Him. For if, whilst we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son : much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life. Wherefore my lips and heart shall shew forth His praise, from henceforth forevermore. Amen.

OR THUS :

Almighty, and most Merciful God and Father, we give Thee hearty thanks, that of thine infinite mercy, Thou has given thine only begotten Son to be our Mediator, and the propitiation for our sins, and also our meat and drink unto eternal life ; and dost also grant us true faith, whereby we become partakers of these Thy benefits, for the confirmation of which faith, Thy beloved Son has instituted His holy supper. We beseech Thee, most faithful God and Father, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, to ble-s this commemoration of our Lord Jesus Christ, and showing forth of His death unto our daily growth in true faith and in fellowship with Him, for the sake of Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

(The minister shall then pronounce the benediction :)

The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord let the light of His countenance shine upon thee, and be merciful unto thee. The Lord lift His countenance upon thee, and grant thee His peace. Amen.

Of the Power of the Keys, and Christian Discipline.

Whereas the proper and christian administration and use of the holy sacraments requires not only that they be observed in such form as has been appointed of God, but also that they be not allowed to such persons as are excluded therefrom by the word of God ; it is necessary that christian excommunication shall be exercised in the church not merely in word but in very deed. If therefore there should be any in the congregation, who are guilty of blasphemous doctrines, or of grievous sins, they shall not be admitted to the Lord's supper until they show amendment.

The Papal } And whereas urgent necessity requires that the
bann. } christian church be freed from the intolerable pre-

sumption, and terrible tyranny of the papish bann, whereby the Pope and his crew cast every thing under his feet; and whereas not only that which is evil should be eradicated and torn up, but also that which is good should be planted instead thereof; it is no less necessary that a christian and appropriate discipline should be instituted in christian congregations, according to the injunction of our Lord (Math. xviii: 17, 18), and for the good of the church.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>The elders of the church, & not the ministers alone, have the power of the keys in the case of open sins.</p> | } | <p>But to prevent this exclusion from the use of the sacraments from falling into abuse and disorder, as in Popery; proper order and moderation shall be maintained, as is directed by Christ and the Apostle Paul. And above all this power shall not be vested in one or several church officers, or other individuals, but in the entire christian congregation, to whom the ministers as well as the humblest member of the church are subject. For if every preacher might put under bann whomsoever he would, at his own pleasure, the discipline would not be that instituted by Christ, but of Antichrist's devising.</p> |
|--|---|---|

Wherefore several honest and god-fearing men shall be selected from every congregation, as occasion and necessity may require, who on behalf—and in the name of the whole congregation, shall in connection with the ministers, take notice of such persons as are offensive either in consequence of dangerous errors in faith, or of sinful lives; (such as whoremongers, misers, idolaters, slanderers, drunkards, or of otherwise disorderly conduct,) so that they may be admonished, once, twice, or thrice, according to circumstances, to amend their ways. And should they then not change their lives, they shall be separated from the congregation, by forbidding them the holy sacrament, until they promise and give proof of amendment.

(Thus closes the third part of the Liturgy. The next general division contains a number of interesting and instructive services for various occasions. Of these we shall translate several in their regular order.)

IV.

OF OTHER CHURCH CUSTOMS AND SERVICES.

Of festivals and holy-days.

Holy-days shall be kept in the same manner as Sabbath.

The following days shall be regularly observed.

All Sabbath-days.

Christmas with the day following. New-year's day. Easter with the day following. Ascension day. Whitsuntide with the following day.

The scriptures to be preached upon on each of these festivals, have already been designated.

1. *Of Church-psalmody and Garments.*

In reference to the singing of Psalms, the Apostle Paul admonishes it to be done not only with the mouth, but with the heart, and that all shall be done to the edification of the church. But since the heart cannot praise God with what it does not understand; we herewith enjoin that no other but German psalms be sung in our churches, and that the same be selected with reference to the occasion and doctrine. Furthermore ministers shall use genteel and plain apparel, in the discharge of their official duties, as on other occasions.

2. *Direction concerning the publication of marriages, and introductory form.*

Whereas marriage is acceptable to God, and honorable in all, it is proper that it should be entered upon in the fear of God, sacredly and honorably. Wherefore it is a commendable christian rule that those recently betrothed, should be publicly announced in the church, and so be introduced into this holy state. Thus may they, and others, previously united in matrimony, receive profitable instruction from the word of God, concerning their relation and duties, and also be encouraged under the trials common to their state, and receive the prayers of the whole congregation, for God's blessing upon them.

This shall be done in the following manner: The minister shall admonish and strictly insist upon it that persons betrothed,

shall call upon with him several mutual friends as witnesses, in order to announce their intention to him a sufficient length of time before the rite is solemnized in the church, to enable him to ascertain whether they may be scripturally and lawfully united, lest their marriage should cause scandal and offence, and it should be found necessary to divorce them.

Wherefore henceforth every intended marriage shall be announced three times, or three several Sabbaths, in the church before the pulpit, in the presence of the assembled congregation.

Form of publishing a marriage.

N. and N. desiring to be united in holy matrimony according to due christian order, ask the prayers of the congregation; that they may be enabled to enter upon this holy state in the name of God, and maintain it to His praise. Should any person therefore have ought to object in the matter, he is requested to announce it in due time, or ever thereafter keep silence, and withhold all hindrance. God grant unto them His blessing. Amen.

Furthermore the names of the betrothed, and their witnesses, shall be recorded in a particular book, kept for the purpose in every church. Having been thus published for three Sabbaths, and presented themselves on the appointed wedding-day in the Church, (which however may not be on a Sabbath or Holy-day, so that persons may not be kept from the regular service by the marriage-festivities;) they shall stand in the front pews until called out by the minister, who shall place himself before the sacramental table, and there address them with the following exhortation:

(Then follows a marriage-ceremony, which to the parties addressed would doubtless in our day seem exceedingly long and tedious, and altogether too theological for such an occasion; but which nevertheless is highly interesting, solemn, and instructive, and deserving of frequent perusal, and careful study by all married persons. Its delivery would, if carefully read, occupy fifteen or twenty minutes at least. As a full and accurate translation of it may be found in the Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church, we shall omit it here, and pass on to the next office for which our Old Liturgy provides.)

Of the visitation of the Sick.

It is the Pastor's duty to give special attention & sympathy to each member of his flock. Acts: 20: 30.

The office of a true and faithful Pastor not only demands that he publicly instruct the flock over which he is placed, but also as far as possible privately admonish, reprove and comfort each one in particular.

But man is never more in need of divine instruction and comfort, than when suffering under an afflictive dispensation, when visited by calamity and sickness, and especially when overtaken by the sorrows of death.

1. Why the sick need special attention. } For under such afflictions, a man's conscience is more apt to be disquieted than at any other time, inasmuch as he feels himself as it were summoned to judgment of God. And moreover the assaults of Satan are more violent at such times, who hopes utterly to crush the poor, sick, and troubled heart, and finally precipitate the soul into the dark abyss of despair.

2. Why Pastors owe such faithfulness to the sick. Ps. 6: 10; Jer. 57: 16. } Wherefore as Ministers are the servants of God, and God is pleased, along with other glorious names, to reveal Himself especially under this, that He is "the refuge of the distressed, and saveth those that are of a broken and contrite heart," it is the duty of all Ministers to console distressed hearts, with all sympathy, faithfulness and diligence, and direct them, according to the gospel, unto Jesus Christ, who promiseth to help them in those exceedingly precious words: "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest."—Matth. xi: 28.

To what the Pastor shall have special regard in the commencement of his visits to the sick. } In visiting a sick person, the Minister must primarily pay attention to the particular state of his mind, and ascertain what his grief and distress may be; whether he is merely concerned about his bodily sufferings or the fear of death, or whether he is more particularly troubled on account of his sins and their penalty, or is otherwise tempted. When this has been duly ascertained, he shall impart suitable instruction and comfort wisely and prudently adapting the medicine to his sickness, condition, and perplexity, and taking care to say neither too little nor too much.

But inasmuch as all the sick are not afflicted with the same anxiety and distress, and therefore no such form of instruction and comfort can be prescribed as would be suitable for all cases;

the following points may nevertheless (according to circumstances) be presented and dwelt upon.

Truths to be impressed upon the minds of the sick.

Cause of all sickness.

First: That our sicknesses do not come upon us accidentally, but from the hand of God, in His paternal providence, so that we may be brought to feel our sins as the cause of all our misery and wo, humble ourselves before God, and implore His grace and help. Wherefore the minister must see well to it, that the sick acknowledge and feel their sins, and heartily deplore and repent of them. Should this not be the case, he must faithfully hold up the law of God, and so set their sins before their eyes, in order that they may know and feel the merited wrath of God against sin, and awake to a desire for mercy. For without such knowledge and conviction they will not be susceptible of true and solid comfort.

The grace of God for the pardon of sin.

But as soon as the sick give evidence of such grief of heart, they shall not be further alarmed, but encouraged with the promises of the gospel. And thus in the second place, he shall proclaim unto them the grace of God in Jesus Christ, promised in the gospel to all penitent and believing sinners. John iii: 16; Math. xi: 28; Ezek. xxxiii: 11; Rom. viii: 1, 31-34, 38, 39, &c.; 1 Tim. i: 15; John i: 7, 9; Is. liii: 4, 5.

And such comfort can be very appropriately derived from the first question of the Catechism, and impressed by the scriptures there quoted, or others of like import; as for instance that their sick and afflicted body, as confined to the bed of disease, together with the weary and distressed spirit, belong unto the Lord Jesus Christ, are redeemed by His precious blood from sin, and all the power of the devil, and will be preserved unto eternal life. In the same manner the articles of our christian faith may be explained, the minister showing from the word of God, how each one, especially the last four, afford consolation to the sick and afflicted.

Exhortation to patience.

In the third place, the minister shall present good reasons drawn from the word of God, why the sick should resign themselves wholly to the will of God, so that should it please their allwise and faithful Father in heaven, to call them away in their sickness from this vale of tears, they may cheerfully renounce their weary and wasting life, and everything earthly, and prepare themselves for an eternal and blessed life above; not permitting wife or children, or friends, or pleasures or riches, or whatever else the world may possess, that is counted desirable, to distress them. Especially since there is

no comparison between those things which we leave behind, and those awaiting us in heaven. Our wives and children will be well provided for by the Lord, who is the Father of the widow and orphan. Our kind and dear friends, whom we leave, will soon follow us to our eternal home. Temporal possessions are perishing, and could not long comfort us. Whilst there we shall find fulness of joy, and at God's right hand pleasures for evermore. Phil. i: 23; Matth. x: 37; 1 Cor. vii: 29, 30, 31; Philip. iii: 8, 9; Ps. 68: 6; 46: 9; 2 Sam. xii: 23; Ps. 49: 18; xvi: 11; 1 Cor. ii: 9:

It may be proper also sometimes, when the sick are visited for the first time, to address them with the following exhortation, or something similar thereto:

Beloved Friend, since our heavenly Father hath visited you with bodily infirmity, it becomes you to receive this fatherly chastisement of the Almighty with patience, casting yourself upon His own good and gracious pleasure, in full assurance, that all things shall work together for good to them that love God. And that you may properly do this, consider diligently the following points set forth in the word of God. First, that all bodily afflictions are sent upon men by the Lord, on account of sin. For death came by sin, together with all the miseries belonging to the kingdom of death; so that had sin not entered the world, neither death nor disease would ever have afflicted mankind. But since we are brought under sin by the fall of our first parents Adam and Eve, through the instigation of the Devil, we are also subject to the punishment threatened against sin by God, which is death, and all the infirmities, sicknesses, misery and wo, that lead to death.

Christ redeems } On the other hand however, that we may
from sin and } not despair in our sins, and sicknesses, and temp-
death. } tations, nor perish in the fear and anguish of
death, you must consider that God, of His great compassion and mercy, appointed and gave His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, to be our Mediator, Redeemer, and Saviour. He assumed our nature, and offered Himself in the same for the satisfaction of our sins, all which were heaped upon Him by our Heavenly Father, as we are assured in His blessed Gospel. And now all are commanded to repent, believe and trust, that for the sake of this satisfaction and atonement of Jesus Christ His Son, He is willing again to become our reconciled Father forever, to forgive all our sins, as though we never had committed any, and to grant unto us the Holy Ghost, by whom we may be renewed in the image of God, unto eternal life. And further we are to be as-

sured, that He will raise up our bodies in the last day by His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, re unite them with the soul, and make them like unto His own most glorious body, and admit us, as His own redeemed people, to the heavenly inheritance, to joys which no eye hath seen, no ear heard, and no heart conceived ; all which is also confirmed and sealed unto us by the right use of the holy sacraments.

Assurance of the } For as certainly as we and our children are
pardon of sin by } baptized with water, by which bodily defile-
baptism. } ments are removed so certainly are we also
washed, cleansed and sanctified by the blood and Spirit of Christ, from our inward impurities. That is, God has, for the sake of the shedding of Christ's blood, pardoned all our sins, and sanctifies us by His Holy Spirit unto eternal life.

By the holy } And as certainly as we see, in the Holy Supper,
supper. } that the bread of the Lord is broken, and the cup
extended to us, and we eat and drink of the bread and wine in remembrance of Him, so certainly is also the body of our Lord Jesus Christ offered and broken and His blood shed on the cross for us, and thus become the true manna, the proper meat and drink for our souls unto eternal life.

We are therefore to feel assured, by the promised grace of God, offered to us in the gospel and in the holy sacraments, that no sins are so great and grievous, as to exclude us from the mercy of God in Jesus Christ ; and thus we may comfort ourselves with true faith in the merits of His sufferings and death, and embrace the same with hearty confidence.

In the third place, we must surrender our will entirely to that of our gracious and eternally righteous Father, not being terrified or alarmed at death, knowing that the temporal death of believers is only a sleep, and no death, yea an end of all the misery and wretchedness of this sinful life, and the door of entrance into eternal life. Neither should our husbands, wives, or children, father, mother, or friends, or aught that may be dear to us in this world, distress us, because we must be torn from them, and bid them adieu, seeing that nothing we forsake here is worthy of comparison with the felicity we shall find in heaven ; and that our heavenly Father who hath hitherto preserved us, will also be a Father to those whom we leave behind, that He will have compassion on them, and provide for them, as He hath hitherto done for us.

Wherefore beloved Friend, possess your soul in patience, and commend yourself, soul and body, unto your faithful heavenly Father, and unto your Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath redeemed

you, not doubting but that He will lay nothing upon you beyond your strength, and help you to bear all, and so order the issue of your affliction, that you shall not only be able to endure it, but that it shall be promotive of His glory and your eternal welfare and salvation. It is your duty also cheerfully to forgive any that may have wronged you, even your enemies, and patiently await promised deliverance. And should it please the Lord to raise you up again from your sick bed, and restore you to health, it will become you to exercise yourself more diligently than ever in earnest and sincere repentance and in holiness of life, remembering the command of Christ: "behold thou art made whole, sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee."——

And inasmuch as it is the duty of Pastors to visit the sick of their flock not only once but frequently, and without waiting for special invitation, in order that these visits may not be fruitless, they should read a chapter of the sacred scriptures to them, unless their weakness or illness should forbid it. Among those most appropriate for the comfort of the afflicted are the following: John 10, 14, 15, 16, 17; Luke 15; Rom. 5, and 8; 1st Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 4, 5; Is. 53; Ps. 22, 23, 25, 27, 42, 51, 91, 103, &c.

Should however the debility or suffering of the sick not allow of their listening to an entire chapter or Psalm, brief passages of scripture, selected from among the most consoling may be slowly repeated and impressed on their mind, such as Matth. ix: 2, Be of good cheer, my son, thy sins are forgiven thee. 1 John 1: 7, The blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God cleanse us from all sin. Phil. 1: 21, 23, For me to live is Christ, but to die is gain, &c. Ps. 73: 25, 26, Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth, &c. Rom. xiv: 8, For whether we live we live unto the Lord or whether we die, &c. Ps. 37: 5, 7, Commit thy way unto the Lord, &c. Job xix: 25, I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c. Ps. xxx: 5, For His anger endureth but for a moment, &c.

The Pastor shall also unite in prayer with those present, whenever the circumstances will allow of it, using either the following language, or something similar thereto:

Prayer with the Sick.

Everlasting and most merciful God and Father, in whose hand lieth life and death, and who dost so continually preserve us, that without Thy will not a hair can fall from our head, and by Whom all things that befall us in this life are made subservi-

ent to our salvation: We beseech Thee, that as Thou visitest us with bodily infirmities and sorrows, Thou wouldest also grant us the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, so that Thy Fatherly chastenings may teach us rightly to know Thy Justice and Mercy. For we confess that our multiplied sins have richly merited these chastenings. Yet would we regard these visitations of Thy gracious Providence, not as intimations of Thy wrath, but of Thy paternal love toward us, seeing Thou chastenest us that we may not be condemned at last with this wicked world. O! most merciful God, forgive we implore Thee, all our sins, for the sake of the bitter passion and death of Jesus Christ Thy Son, our only Mediātor and Saviour. Grant us patience and steadfastness, in true dependence upon Thy mercy. Alleviate graciously our sufferings, laid upon us by Thy righteous hand, and so control them according to Thy Fatherly will, that they may subserve the glory of Thy name, and the salvation of our souls, for the sake of Thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father, &c.

Grant us also continual and growing steadfastness in our old, undoubted Christian Faith:

I believe in God the Father, &c.

Prayer for the Dying.

Almighty, and most merciful God and Father, I praise and thank Thee, for my body and my soul, and that Thou hast so kindly and mercifully preserved and protected them. But above all I praise Thee that Thou hast given unto me Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, who hath redeemed me from sin, and all the power of the devil, and eternal death, and damnation. And since it is now Thy holy will to call me from this valley of tears to Thyself in eternal joy and bliss, and make me thus a full partaker of the glory procured for me by Thy dear Son, my Saviour: I beseech Thee graciously to alleviate for me the pains and terrors of my approaching death, nor suffer me to be tempted in the last agony beyond the strength which Thou hast given me. O! gracious Lord, strengthen the weakness of my flesh, by the power of Thy Holy Spirit, and enable me, with true and firm reliance upon Thy mercy, manifested in Jesus Christ, to depart in peace, with aged Simeon, and enter joyfully into Thy heavenly kingdom. Most Gracious Father, into Thy hands I commit my Spirit for Thou hast redeemed me, O! Lord, Thou faithful God. Amen.

Of administering the communion to the Sick.

The sick must not be permitted to lie long without being visited. } Whereas experience proves that many persons neglect themselves & their friends in sickness, so that they sometimes even die without being visited or comforted by their Pastor ; and further that too many then first send for the minister, to visit them and administer the sacrament ; when they are already in the agonies of death, or so oppressed with sickness, that they can no more receive instruction, or give account of themselves : It is thought highly necessary, that sick persons, especially those who may not have friends around them able to instruct and comfort them, should not be permitted to lie longer than three days at most, without sending for the proper Pastor. And in case this should be neglected, the minister shall feel it his duty to visit them without a special invitation.

Why the Holy Supper is to be administered to the sick. } And although the people are to be instructed at the regular weekly services, and at other times, how they may comfort themselves by fellowship with Christ, by which they have been previously assured in Baptism and the Supper, according to the gracious promise of God : nevertheless, if the sick desire to receive the supper of the Lord in their own houses, it shall not be denied them, but under these two considerations, which are to be carefully noted :

First.—If the minister has reason to suspect that the sick person holds the *opinion de opere operato*, and regards the communion as essential to his salvation, he shall earnestly and faithfully dissuade him from such an idolatrous error, and instruct him in the right use of the Lord's Supper.

Secondly—Those in the house, or present with the sick person, shall be exhorted to unite with him in the communion, so that this institution of the Lord may not be violated ; remembering that His Supper must be celebrated by a company of Christians, be it large or small.

As to the Form to be used on such occasions ; the minister shall use an abbreviation of that given above, for the instruction of the sick person. After this the Confession of sin shall be read together with the scriptures assigned for the comfort of the sick, the Lord's prayer, the Articles of our common Faith, and the words of the institution of the supper. Then the supper itself may be administered, and the whole service concluded with the usual thanking and benediction.

Of the Visitation of Prisoners.

Prisoners should receive
timely and frequent vis-
its.

Inasmuch as prisoners need consola-
tion no less than the sick, they shall
receive the services of the Minister not

only at the time of their execution, and when the terrors of death are upon them, when they are hardly capable of comprehending or receiving comfort, but shall be previously often visited and consoled. And if more than one minister is at hand, they may alternately attend to this duty.

Especially such as
are greatly dis-
tressed.

And should some seem to be particularly
cast down, they shall be visited the more
frequently and diligently.

What instructions
they should receive.

And whereas prisoners are mostly very
ignorant of the true basis of salvation, they
shall be questioned concerning the principal points of christian doctrine, and made to learn and recite them. These shall then be explained to them according to the circumstances and crime of the prisoner. The doctrines of sin, the judgment of God against sin, and justification through Christ shall be particularly pressed upon them. And in connection with this, the following or similar scriptures shall be presented to them and explained, for their admonition and comfort.

Exhortations to a discovery of sin, and true repentance toward God.

Isaiah lv : 6, 7, "Seek ye the Lord while He is near, &c." Ezek. xviii : 33, "Thinkest thou that I have pleasure in the death of the sinner, &c."—v : 27, "If the wicked forsake his unrighteousness which he hath done, &c." Jer. iii : 7, 13, 22, "Turn thou unto Me. Only acknowledge thine iniquity, &c." Malac. iii : 7, "Turn unto Me, and I will, &c." Hos. xiv : 3, Joel ii : 12, 13, "Turn unto Me with all your heart, with fasting, &c." Is. i : 16, "Wash you, make you clean, &c." Jer. xxxi : 18, "Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned, &c."

Consolatory Passages.

Math. xi : 28, 29, "Come unto me all ye that are weary, &c." Rom. v : 8-10, "For God commendeth His love toward us, &c." Rom. viii : 1, "There is therefore now no condemnation, &c."—also v : 31-39, "What shall we say then? If

God be for us, &c." Luke xxiii: 32, 39-43, "And there were also two others, malefactors, led with Him to be put to death. And one of the malefactors, which were hanged, railed, &c." Luke xviii: 13, "And the publican stood afar off, &c." Matth. ix: 2, "Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." 1 John i: 7, "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." 1 Tim. i: 15, "This a faithful saying, &c." John vi: 39, 40, "This is the will of the Father that hath sent me, that I should lose nothing, &c." John x: 28, 29, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, &c."

Examples of great sinners who obtained mercy.

David, Manasseh, Mary Magdalene, the Thief on the cross, Peter, Paul, the Prodigal Son, &c., &c. In some cases also, the thirty second Psalm may be read; also Ps. 50, 51, 130, the prayer of Manasseh, &c.

Of the Burial of the Dead.

In the burial of the dead all popish and superstitious ceremonies are to be avoided.

But it is nevertheless proper for us to commit our departed and deceased friends to the earth with respect and decency, and to connect therewith such services as may be profitable to the living.

In the first place when the hour has arrived for removing the corpse to the place of interment. the church bell may be rung, but simply for the purpose of informing those who may desire to accompany it that the hour of assembling has arrived. And should the children of the school be present, the removal of the corpse may be attended with singing.

After this, when the body has been brought to the church for burial, the minister shall read to the assembly, the scripture concerning the dead in Christ from 1 Thess. iv: 13 to the end of the chap.; or the narrative of the death and resurrection of Lazarus, John xi: 1-47; or passages of similar import; prefacing what he reads with an introduction to the following effect:

Beloved Friends, We have now committed to the grave, one who we comfortably believe and hope, was a true member of our Lord Jesus Christ. And that we may not leave this place without profitable instruction, we will select a portion of the word of God, and meditate upon its application to the solemn

occasion on which we have been assembled. Let us however first of all supplicate God for His Spirit and grace, in the language of that prayer which our Saviour himself hath taught us:

Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

Funeral sermons shall avoid all extravagant praises of the dec'd. } Hereupon shall follow a short sermon or exhortation, in which all extravagant commendation of the departed shall be avoided, lest funeral sermons should fall into abuse.

Topics to be especially dwelt upon. } Funeral sermons or exhortations shall aim especially at admonishing and exhorting those who are in attendance to such holiness of life as may issue in a happy and peaceful death. This will be the better secured, and be done more profitably, if one or the other of the following topics is dwelt upon, viz: Of the death, burial, resurrection, and glorification of the body.

In reference to death the following points merit consideration:

1. Whence death proceeds, viz: from the fall and disobedience of our first parents; and why it has been inflicted upon men.

2. The natural effect and operation of death upon men, viz: by it we are deprived of all temporal comforts, made subject to bodily sickness and grief, and afflicted in spirit with inward troubles.

3. How great a blessing death hath been made through Jesus Christ, since all the sufferings of believers are now hereby transformed into eternal joys.

4. The necessary preparation for death. To this belongs—First, a true firm faith, with which the grace of God in Christ is embraced. Secondly, True conversion to God, perseverance and growth in the same, since without this there can be no true faith.

Thirdly, That we deny ourselves, that is cast away all our evil lusts, submit entirely to the will of God, and allow nothing to be so dear to us, that we would not be ready cheerfully to leave it for His sake.

Fourthly, Seasonable and habitual meditations upon the grace and salvation furnished in the word of God, and upon our approaching departure from the world.

Fifthly, Earnest and constant supplication to God for the continual supply of His holy spirit, and a peaceful death.

Sixthly, How to comfort ourselves in view of our own death, and that of our friends, and dispel the fear of it from our hearts. Against the fear of eternal death we may suggest this comfort to believers, that Christ died for our sins, and arose again for our justification: Whence follows—

1. That there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ, and they will not taste the bitterness of eternal death.

2. That we are already transplanted with Christ in heavenly places; that we are as fully assured of our blessed resurrection, and glorification, as though we were already in the actual enjoyment of future glory.

Against the fear of temporal death and its antecedent pains and temptations, we have this assured comfort, that God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we can bear; that He will also be with us in the dark valley of death; and that we with His Son Jesus Christ, our Saviour, shall through the sufferings of death be crowned with honor and glory.

In connection with what is said concerning the Burial of the dead, reasons may be assigned why the bodies of the deceased are buried in (or near) the house of God, and accompanied thither with due respect and decency by an assembly of friends. Especially should it be explained that it is not done as though the deceased would be benefitted at all by our funeral services, seeing that believers, as soon as they depart enter into eternal life, and unbelievers into eternal damnation, and the former therefore do not need our help, whilst the latter cannot receive it. But these services are held for the benefit of the living, that they may thus renew their confession of faith in the resurrection of the dead; show their affection for their departed friends; praise God for the comfortable assurance they have that all the faithful pass from this life into eternal felicity, and that He is thus gathering unto Himself from our midst an eternal Church; and beseech Him to preserve them in the enjoyment of this comfort unto the end, and so collect and qualify from among them such as shall forever acceptably serve Him; and therefore lead them to a proper contemplation of the death which awaits them.

In reference to the doctrines of the resurrection of the dead, and the glorification of the bodies and souls of believers, the assembly shall be especially instructed in the certainty of the resurrection of our bodies from death, concerning the subsequent condition of the faithful in eternal life, and then be shown how both doctrines minister to the amendment of our lives, and the peace of our consciences.

Upon these and similar points therefore, the minister shall briefly instruct the people on funeral occasions, by the exposition of such portions of scripture as are appropriate.

After the sermon or exhortation a prayer shall be offered having more immediate reference to the subject which has been set forth, according to the following form :—

(Here follows a prayer, and other services connected with the interment of the body. A number of pages however being wanting in the copy before us, a translation of the remaining portions of this interesting section must be given up. It is to be hoped however that this deficiency may be supplied from some other source. The same remark will apply to the *form of baptizing Ana-baptists*, which appears to follow the Burial service, the first paragraphs of which are also missing.)

Formula in Baptizatione Judæi adhibenda.

Primo praelegantur verba Formulæ ordinariæ ab initio usque ad verba: And although our children, quorum loco legentur sequentia.

But although the children of believers, notwithstanding their inability to understand the mysteries of Baptism, are nevertheless to be baptized by virtue of the covenant in which they stand with God; it is by no means to be permitted in the case of such as have reached adult years from among Jews, Turks, or Heathen, unless they have previously felt their sins, and acknowledged their repentance and faith in Christ. Thus John the Baptist baptized those only who confessed their sins; and our Lord commanded his disciples to teach all nations, and baptize them, adding the promise, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Wherefore the Apostles also, according to this rule, baptized no adults, but such as made profession of their repentance and faith. Whence it is evident, that we are not permitted to baptize an adult, or one that has reached mature years, especially one who has been a Jew, Mohammedan or Heathen, unless he have first been made acquainted, by the preaching of the gospel, with the mysteries contained in Holy Baptism, and so be prepared to give an account of his faith by oral confession.

Whereas therefore you, N. N., by birth a Jew have presented yourself at this time, desiring to be baptized, to the end that you may thus receive the seal of fellowship with the church of God, and also to signify that you not only embrace the christian religion in which you have been instructed, and whereof you have made confession before us, but also purpose to regulate your life according thereto by the grace of God; I exhort you, in the presence of God and his church, to answer the following questions uprightly and without hypocrisy.

1. Do you heartily believe in the only true God, distinct in

three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who out of nothing made heaven and earth and all that is therein, and continues so to uphold and govern the same, that nothing can take place in heaven or upon the earth without His divine will? Then answer—*Yea* : Respon. *Yea*.

2. In the next place do you believe that you were conceived and born in sin, and wert consequently by nature a child of wrath, incapable of any good, and inclined to all evil, and that in thought, word, and deed you have often broken each of the ten commandments of God; and do you heartily deplore these sins? Then answer—*Yea* :—Res. *Yea*.

3. Do you further believe that Jesus Christ is true and eternal God, and also true man, who assumed His human nature from the flesh and blood of the virgin Mary, and that He is given to be your Redeemer; and that by faith in Him you receive the forgiveness of sin through His blood, and so are made a member of Christ and His Church by the power of the Holy Ghost? Then Answer *Yea* : Res. *Yea*.

4. Do you receive the entire sacred scriptures, contained in the books of Moses and the Prophets of the Old, and the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of the New Testaments, as the very word of God; and do you assent to all the articles of the Christian Religion as taught in the Reformed Church of Heidleberg and the entire Palatinate, according to the word of God, and do you purpose to remain steadfast in the same until the end of your life? And do you accordingly renounce all heresies and errors that conflict with these articles, especially unbelieving and Christ denying Judaism, and herewith solemnly vow, that in the fellowship of this christian Church, you will not only give heed to the preaching of the word of God, but diligently persevere in the use of the Holy sacrament? Then Answer—*Yea* : Res. *Yea*.

Votum.

May the Almighty and most merciful God grant unto you this your solemn purpose and pledge, His grace and blessing through Jesus Christ. Amen.

In order now that this holy ordinance of God may promote His glory, and minister to our comfort and edification, let us unitedly call upon His holy name:—

Almighty and eternal God, &c.—*per omnia, ut habet formula ordinaria, modo loco verborum: this child, ponantur this Thy servant.—Our Father, &c.*

Confess with me also the articles, &c.

Do you now desire, with true faith in the promise of God in Jesus Christ, given unto you and all of us to be our Saviour, that He would be our God to the latest generation, to be baptized upon this faith, and receive the seal of adoption with God? Then Answer *Yea*: Res. *Yea*.

Ad testes presentes.

And are you, who are here present to be witnesses of this baptism, willing to be witnesses thereof, and of the confession made by this person now to be baptized? Then Answer *Yea*: Res. *Yea*.

Thou hitherto named N. N., what name do you choose in this new religion you are embracing?

Hic flexis genibus sacramentum Baptismi accipiat.

Let us praise the Lord.

Almighty and most Merciful God our Father, we praise and thank Thee, that for the sake of the death of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, Thou hast forgiven all our sins, and by Thy Holy Spirit made us members of Thine only-begotten Son, and accepted of us as Thy children, all which is sealed and confirmed unto us by holy Baptism. We also beseech Thee, for the sake of Thy dear Son, that Thou wouldest ever govern this baptized person by Thy Holy Spirit, that he may continually grow up in Christ, confess Thy fatherly goodness and mercy, which Thou hast manifested unto him and to us all, and live in all righteousness under our only Prophet, Priest and King Jesus Christ, fighting valiantly and prevailing against sin, the devil, and his kingdom; and so may ever praise and glorify Thee and Thy Son Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Ghost, the only true God. Amen.

Post gratiarum actionem.

And now I exhort you, N. N., who have been solemnly baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to consider, that by the reception of this sign and seal of the Divine covenant in Baptism, you have publicly, in the presence of God, and His holy angels, and this christian congregation, renounced the devil, the world with all their works and lusts, surrendered yourself unto the Lord, and obligated yourself henceforth to live unto Him in all holiness and obedience according

to the gospel. And do you, who have been present as witnesses, regard it as your solemn duty, ever to encourage this baptized person to use all diligence in endeavoring to grow in grace and in the fear of God, according to the articles of our christian faith, and the doctrine which has been revealed from heaven, and is contained in the Old and New Testaments. And may the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ mercifully grant this. Amen.

Claudit actum communis benedictio:

The Lord bless thee and keep thee, &c.

Form to be used upon the admission of young persons to a public profession of their faith, and on their first approach to the table of the Lord.

Address to the congregation.

Beloved in the Lord, these young persons who now appear before you, are fellow-heirs with us of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. In their infancy they were incorporated with Christ and His Church by Holy Baptism. And now, having been instructed according to the measure of the grace of God granted unto them, in the knowledge of divine truth, and christian piety, they desire to be united in closer and firmer fellowship with their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by participation in the Holy Supper. And to give evidence of their sincere desire and pious purpose, as also of their faith, and their determination to submit themselves entirely to Christ their Lord, and devote themselves to our true christian fellowship; and further to assure you of their purpose by the grace of God to continue steadfast in this faith against all temptations unto death, they here present themselves publicly before God and this christian congregation, to make their public profession and vow.

Our Lord Jesus Christ calls and commands all, who feel their infirmities, and the heavy burden of their sins, to come unto Him, with the consoling assurance that He will grant them abundant rest. And to increase our confidence in this invitation He hath, besides His blessed word and holy Baptism, also instituted and appointed the sacrament of His body and blood, that it, together with the preaching of His word and Baptism, may be communicated unto pious and contrite believers, for the confirmation of their faith, and the comfort of their troubled consciences. By the use of this sacrament we may however also be encouraged and obligated to new obedience and sanctification. It would therefore not become us, to hinder or reject those

from the grace and mercy of God, whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath called, and to whom He extends His rich blessings.

In order therefore that we may do all in our power to promote their soul's salvation, we will now receive the profession of their faith, and their consecration of themselves to God and His Church, comforting them with the promise of divine grace and the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and finally supplicate God graciously to complete the work which He has so mercifully begun in their hearts.

(Then follows a summary of the Heidelberg Catechism, of which we have a sufficiently full and accurate translation in the well-known Compendium, to render a translation and insertion of it unnecessary in this place.)

This profession of faith being made, the confirmants shall approach the altar, and each one answer and pledge himself in the following questions.

I. N. N., do you believe heartily all that you have here professed in answer to the questions which have been asked? Answer, Yea.

II. Do you renounce the devil and all his works and ways, and all worldly wickedness? Ans. Yea.

III. Do you hereby solemnly devote yourself to the obedience of Christ and His Church, according to the word of God, and promise to grow in faith, and knowledge, and piety, and persevere in so doing against all temptations until by the grace of God you reach a blessed end, faithfully holding to all that you have here professed?

Ans. Yea: By the grace and assistance of our Lord Jesus Christ.

When this answer is given, they shall confirm the vow by extending to the minister their right hand, who shall then, laying his hands upon each one, say:

May God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, grant unto you His grace, defend and protect you against all sin, strengthen and confirm you in all piety, for the sake of the merits of our only Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Address to the Confirmants.

Having now made a profession of your faith, and solemnly vowed that it is your firm purpose to live consistently with this faith; you may approach the table of the Lord, if you really

hunger and thirst after this spiritual food, and heartily propose henceforth to live godly in Christ Jesus. Only consider well that God is a true and faithful God, Whom it becometh us to serve in spirit and in truth. You have been already incorporated with Christ and His Church by Baptism, and are thereby obligated to serve God all the days of your life. But now you have with full knowledge and personal consent confirmed this obligation, and shall accordingly be admitted to the holy sacrament. Be not deceived, God is not mocked. Should you not remain faithful in the knowledge of the truth; or deny the same by a sinful life; your condemnation will be the more dreadful, seeing that you know the will of the Lord, and have so solemnly bound yourself unto it, and yet have not done it.

God Himself, and this congregation is witness to your promise, and you will be required to give account thereof in the last day. Wherefore see to it that you pay your vows. Think not that you are already perfect, but press onward that you may grow in knowledge and in grace unto perfection in the Lord.

Further address to the Congregation.

And may you, Beloved in the Lord, be this day reminded of the covenant which you have made with God. Receive these young Brethren and Sisters, into closer christian fellowship, as fellow-guests at the table of the Lord, and seek to promote your own and their salvation. And as this is not a matter of human power and skill, it may well become us to call upon God for the assistance of His Holy Spirit, that He may graciously finish the work which He has begun in our souls.

(The service is then closed with prayer. Of this we are unable to give a translation, as a greater part of it also is missing.)

Concluding Remarks.

Before taking leave of this good old Liturgy, we may indulge in giving expression to a few thoughts naturally and forcibly suggested by the extracts which have now been presented.

1. And first of all a book like this must possess unusual interest, if regarded merely in an historical point of view, as *furnishing a specimen and type of the moral and religious character of the Church producing it, and of its full ability to meet*

the demands of religious life and worship. An abstract theological system, or church organization, however beautifully inscribed and laid out on paper, is not worth much, if upon practical application it is found inadequate to the daily wants of religious culture. It may be greatly admired as a masterpiece of ecclesiastical clock-work, when contemplated in a quiescent state. But the regret and ridicule into which this admiration will be resolved, will thus be only the more bitter and biting, when, upon trial, it is discovered that the mainspring is wanting, and indeed that the mechanism is such as will admit of none. Now the ecclesiastical and dogmatical histories of those times tell us most accurately what was the theory of the Reformers in reference to church doctrine and polity, and how this theory proved itself to be something more than a mere dead abstraction by its more general and manifest operations. But this does not altogether satisfy the curiosity of the inquiring mind. Before a system of religion can be entitled to the christian name, it must show its adaptation not merely to general but individual wants, it must prove itself adequate not merely to the task of managing the ark, but of providing for those within it. The christian religion is general and individual, universal and also most minutely particular in its spiritual arrangements and provisions. And the best proof of genuineness which any professedly christian system can give, is honest resemblance to this characteristic feature of Christianity.

Such now is the proof in favor of the Reformed system of the christian religion, presented by the Old Liturgy before us. It furnishes us with a fair, and, to every member of the Reformed Church, a most flattering specimen of the complete adaptedness of that system, to all the purposes of congregational and individual worship, and personal piety. And we may assuredly be indulged for exhibiting no little gratification, in being permitted to claim blood-affinity with this excellent and thoroughly evangelical system, and cherishing most hearty predilection for it. Surely the German Reformed Church of 1850, has no reason to be ashamed of springing from such stock as this! Nor have we any reason for yielding place, excepting through gratuitous politeness—to any other system, springing forth contempor-

aneously with this, from the evangelical agitations of the XVI century!

Through this Liturgy we may look, as through an open window, in upon the practical religious life of our Church in the first years subsequent to the deliverance of long-imprisoned Christianity. We may here see our earlier fathers and brethren in the Lord at their devotions. Other books have told us how vigorously they could contend for the truth on the stage of theological debate—how valiantly they could even fight for it on the battle-field. In other books we learn how clearly they could define their religion as a system of doctrine, and how firmly they could base it on the true foundation. Here we can learn how piously, intelligently, and heartily *their Religion taught them to pray,—how simply, yet scripturally and instructively it enabled them to administer the holy sacraments, and perform the other consolatory services of the Church.* And certainly none can stop to look in at this window, and listen to these holy devotions, without “taking knowledge of these men that they have been with Jesus and learned of Him,” or saying in their heart “surely God is in this place!”

2. In immediate connection with this, the great contrast exhibited between this system of worship, and that of the nominally christian church which had just been forsaken, cannot fail to excite attention. We here see that the conflict and separation was not merely one of abstract theology, carried on by members of the schools, but one of practical worship, in which individual christian devotion was most intimately concerned. And thus viewed *how utter and decided is the separation, from every thing that savors of popish superstition:* We see nothing like an attempt at compromise. The flood of light which brake in through the thick darkness that so long had veiled truth and worship, revealed on the one hand abominations which had usurped the place of righteousness and piety, which our Reformed fathers gladly denounced and renounced, and on the other hand a pure & heavenly system which they most heartily and unqualifiedly preferred. There was no lingering to look back—no desire to gather up and carry a few sacred relics with them. Of such relics

as could be had, full enough would cling to head, and heart, and hand, without special effort to gather and preserve them! And so while the door of escape stood open, they would be off—even though for the time but thinly clad. None could tell how suddenly the door might be shut again! So walking by faith, like Moses, they preferred such simple comforts as God might furnish for the spiritual wants of His believing children, to all the gorgeous trappings, and glittering tinsel connected with the splendid idolatries of an Egyptianized Christianity! And who can refuse to admire the rich and all-sufficient simplicity of the forms of worship here prescribed! Free, to a degree which excites surprise, from all controversial hints, and yet impressing the reader, on every page with the conviction, that, holding the gross superstitions and heresies of Rome in utter abhorrence, every thing popish was most studiously excluded, as unscriptural and pernicious.

And can the spirit thus evinced, and the course thus pursued ever be too heartily approved or too strongly commended? What is it else than cheerful compliance with the terms of true discipleship as fixed by our Lord Himself—"If any man will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross;" "He that putteth his hand to the plow and looketh back is not fit for the kingdom?" What other spirit would we have our Reformed fathers exhibit, or what other course would we have them pursue in the circumstances? Were they not right in breaking truce with Rome, when they discovered that Rome had broken faith with God? Shall they not be justified for flinging the vile superstitions of Popery from them, and that without dalliance, so soon as they detected the sacriligious fraud imposed upon the heritage of the Lord? Which of the Apostles renounced most readily and unreservedly all previous attachments, and predilections for the sake of Christ? Was it not he who was overtaken on his errand of bloody persecution to Damascus, and smitten by the brightness of the Lord down to the earth? And whose spirit, and zeal, and labors, and doctrine, does the true Church admire and commend more heartily than self-denying noble Paul's? No fault is found with him for parting with the

time-honored rites of the Jewish ceremonial without a sigh. It is thought no reproach that he could turn from Moses and Elias, when a greater than both appeared. And shall we find fault with our Reformed progenitors, for turning from the Pope and his idolatrous mass and demon worship without hesitation or regret?

Nor will we! A puerile sentimentalism many write its rhymes in praise of those, whose deep rooted predilections for hoary superstitions, so controlled them, that they could not give them up otherwise than Rachel did her teraphim! But reason and sound judgment, enlightened by the truth, and controlled by a supreme regard for God, and His true worship, will ever be found applauding those who hold Christ's enemies for their enemies, and ask not for time to bid them so much as farewell, when once they have been detected.

And this, as a distinctive peculiarity of the Reformed side of the great evangelical movement of the 16th century, is set forth with special clearness and decision in the Liturgy before us. And the German Reformed Church especially may congratulate itself in view of this most significant and interesting fact. Though possessed of natural feelings which qualify it for understanding full well the hesitations and compromises to which the other sides of the Reformation inclined, an enlightened judgment, and convictions founded on the letter of the Holy Gospels, and on the Spirit of the true Christian Church, will ever give an unequivocal verdict in favor of the example originally set by the noble Zwingli and his pious Zurichers, and afterwards so zealously pursued in the Palatinate under the learned and devout Frederick.

3. And this view of the case will secure more cheerful assent in consideration of another fact, strikingly exhibited in the book before us. Reference is of course had to the spirit of subordination and moderation which reigns throughout. Its influence makes itself felt on every page. Knowing the circumstances under which the Church, of which we have here a liturgical picture, was organized, it is natural to expect some evidences of spiritual licentiousness. But we look in vain for radicalism here.

Having but just cast away the chafing chains of religious tyranny, we wonder at their tolerating any control. But how comparatively easy and quiet the transition, from the iron collar of Popery to the yoke of Christ! From the cross-dishonoring idolatry of the Mass, to the instructive, melting service of the Holy Supper!

Here indeed is such evidence of the law by which the pious Reformers of those days were governed, as all may delight in contemplating! No wonder that such giants in moral courage, when courage was required, and yet such children in all teachableness of disposition, when the Truth offered its holy instructions, were thought fit instruments for the vast objects to be achieved! No age ever produced mightier or meeker men! And this, more than any thing, proves it to have been an age in which the Lord Himself was powerfully present with His wronged and degraded Church, to vindicate its honor.

May the Reformed Church seek to have this spirit more abundantly revived in her present life. She needs it. As her peculiar calling in the Kingdom of the Lord is indicated by it, so this calling also demands the diligent cultivation of this apostolic spirit. As therefore she would be true to herself and her Rock, let her listen to no terms of compromise with bald and baseless superstitions, no matter how innocent their face. And as she would be equally true to herself and Christ's Church, let her consent to no dalliance with the rabid radicalism, by which Satan is even now seeking first to disband the Church, then to subvert all civil rule, and finally destroy the world!

Long may this Old Palatinate Liturgy of 1563, remain with us, as a spiritual amulet against disasters like these!

Easton, Pa.

J. H. A. B.

THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

THE continued inquiries being made in the sphere of natural science, tend more and more, to a confirmation, and substantiation of the truths of revealed religion. The infidel once triumphing in pedantic style over the supposed inconcinnity between the discoveries of science and the truth of revelation, has been brow-beaten and compelled to retreat before the overpowering array of later investigations. Not only is there found to be no discordance, between the deductions of science and the facts of religion, but the most harmonious agreement. The varied departments of philosophy, which were once marshalled in stern array against the revelations of the Bible, are now waving their forced opposition, and joining hands with them in mutual fellowship. That this would ultimately be the case might have been, and was inferred a priori. Theoretically there is no ground for the hypothesis of a contradiction between science and religion. As Nature and Religion are both voluntary emanations of the Divine mind there must be consentaneousness in order to avoid disagreement in God himself. It is reasonable that Nature and Religion springing from the same inexhaustible fountain should flow together like the streams of the Rhine and Saone, in the same channel, though with distinguishable waters. Though our faith in the Divine origin of Christianity going before all natural testimony, could not be overthrown by such a dissonance, yet is it not comforting and strengthening, to have it backed by the evidence drawn from the natural world? The lines and tendencies of scientific research are drawing closer to Divine revelation, and arraying themselves around it in geometrical order. There is a convergence between the results of the discovering philosopher, and the established facts of revelation, so as to give us on a large and grand scale, the picture as described by Homer on his hero's shield; of things and movements heavenly, that appertain unto a higher sphere, hemmed round and embellished by the representations of earthlier and homelier pursuits.

We purpose in this essay to present in miniature form, some of the results in the sphere of *Philological* and *Physiognomical Ethnography*, which tend to establish the record of Moses that all nations of the earth have sprung from one common stock. This question, whether the diversified nations of the earth have sprung from one and the same origin? is not extraneous to the study of relationship between Nature and Revelation. It is interwoven with the whole tissue of the Christian Religion. On

the necessity for a common progenitor rests the doctrine of original sin, and its transmission to succeeding generations; and the central doctrine of Divine Redemption through a one-man Deliverer, uniting and unifying in his person all the qualities and properties of the whole human race. A denial of the unity of the whole human race is virtually an abnegation of these fundamental doctrines of the Christian Religion. If mankind have proceeded from different roots, what becomes of the theory of an organic diffusion of sin; and the extension and expansion of the blessings of Christianity from one great fountain? Reject the supposition of common origin, and you blot out from the inspired record the doctrine of a common sinning and fall in Adam, and the glorious mystery of redemption.

The theories accounting for the marked diversity of races, are as numerous and variable as the different shades of color and habit found in the race itself. They have sprung up and move in close array like the moving pillars of the desert, and like them too many are sand, and fall because of their incompactness and instability. "The Mosaic record" says a learned writer, "does not make it quite clear that the inhabitants of the world descended from Adam and Eve. Moreover the entire or even partial inspiration of the various writings comprehended in the Old Testament, has been, and is, doubted by many persons, including learned divines, and distinguished oriental and biblical scholars. . . . To the grounds of doubt respecting inspiration, which arise from the examination of various narratives, from knowledge of the original and other oriental languages, and from the irreconcilable opposition between the passions and sentiments ascribed to the Deity by Moses, and that religion of peace and love unfolded by the Evangelists, I have only to add, that the representations of all the animals being brought before Adam in the first instance, and, subsequently, of their being all collected in the ark, if we are to understand them as being applied to the living inhabitants of the whole world, are zoologically impossible." The Mosaic expressions "God created man male and female" and again (chap. v.) "in the day that God created man, male and female created he them," are supposed by the above quoted author to refer to a different creation from that of Eve. Even the celebrated Eichhorn, one of the boldest and rashest interpreters which modern Germany has produced is found vindicating the above quotations from the charge here preferred against them.

He however in the end arrived at the same conclusion by a rejection of the Divine inspiration on philological grounds. This exponent of the inspired record was the first who pretended to

have established, what had previously been conjectured; that the Pentateuch was only a combination of historical mythical legends, incorporated by Moses in the Divine record. This inference was unwarrantably deduced from the use of peculiar words. As for instance the word Jehovah is omitted in the first chapter; and is inserted in connection with Elohim in the commencement of the second chapter. In a general description of the cosmogony the self-existent appellation of the Creator alone is used. Elohim is the generic name of God; whilst Jehovah is the name of Israel's God; and is used in a geogonic description, wherein is given a particular account of the earth in its relation to man. The same definite distinction of these terms is found in the record made of the flood. Among the opponents of the theory maintaining a unity of the human race are found the names of Voltaire, Virey and Lamarck. Voltaire in truth was one of the first to observe that "none but a blind man can doubt that the whites, negroes, albinos, Hottentots, Laplanders, Chinese and Americans are entirely distinct races." Virey belonging to the same school, in light and wanton frivolity carried out the theory still farther. Not content with attributing to the Negro a different origin from the European, he goes so far as to suspect a certain fraternity between the Negro and Baboon.

Lamarck collected and arranged in systematic form what had been vaguely and disconnectedly presented by others, and developed the theory to its ultimate point. From the lowest order of created matter up to the immortal spirit, he discerned successive links uniting them in one inseparable whole. The two volumes of his *Philosophie Zoologique* are entirely directed to support this degrading theory; the first to prove how man's bodily organization sprung from a casual, though natural modification, of the ape; the second to show that the spiritual prerogatives of the human mind, are but the extension of the faculties possessed by brutes, and only differ quantitatively, and not qualitatively, from their perceptive powers. This theory was drawn analogically from the regular gradations found to exist, in each distinct kingdom. As in Nature there is a regular ascent in the scale of organized beings, so in the animal realm there must be the same regular gradation. Each animal having new wants, and being driven by them to peculiar habits, gradually changes its organization, until in succeeding generations the distinction becomes inerassibly fixed. Thus for instance a bird, is driven by its wants to take to the water, and either swim or wade; its successors do the same; in the course of many generations, the out-

stretching of its claws produces a web between them, and it becomes a regular water-fowl; or it extends its limbs to walk in deeper places, and gradually its legs are prolonged to the length of the crane's or the flamingo's. These two agencies, combined new wants, and the disposition of Nature to meet them, conspired to make man out of the baboon. One of these probably the Angola Orang, from some untold reason lost the habit of climbing trees, or holding by their hind as well as fore-limbs. After thus perambulating the earth for many generations, the former changed into a shape more suited to their habits, and became feet, and they gradually acquired the habit of walking erect. They now no longer needed their jaws for cropping fruit or for fighting with one another, having their fore feet or hands now disposable for these purposes; and hence by degrees, their snouts shortened, and their faces became more vertical. Progressing still farther in this road to humanization, their grin subsided into a courtly smile, and their jabbering resolved itself into articulate sounds.

This low materialistic theory is abundantly confuted by the experience and observation of several thousand years. The busy ant constructs its labyrinths now in the same manner in which it did in the days of Solomon. The beaver builds its dam now as it did in the days when Pliny lived and wrote. Neither, by any process whatever, have they been able to advance beyond their appointed sphere. Man too has lived with inherent powers, struggling in his nature, and yet they have not externalized themselves in some new and higher development. If the theory were well grounded, we might expect constant and higher processions beyond man. From him would shoot forth new sprouts of living action, to be metamorphosed, inversely from the ancient fable, into some higher nature.

There have been others who supposed that the diverse races originated immediately after the Deluge; the different germs being laid in persons, who escaped the overwhelming waters by clambering on the tops of the loftiest mountains. The absurdity of this hypothesis needs no refutation.

Having thus taken a summary historical survey of the opponents of our theory, we proceed to state in brief the systems for the classification of the races, and will then endeavor by some facts and arguments to show how it was possible for the contraries existing in the Human Race at present to have been brought about. Having done this there will be no difficulty in the supposition that all men have emanated from one generic fountain. This possible solution will create a strong presump-

tive argument, in favor of the Mosaic Record. The human race will be referred to one common channel, which being influenced by terrestrial and local influences, branched off into subordinate streams, thus causing the great diversity which is known to exist at the present time. The present results of ethnographic research enable us to settle conclusively the question: *Could* such varieties as we now see in the human race have sprung from one stock? This demonstrated, we will have removed the grounds on which the deniers of Revelation make so bold a stand. No doubt the farther investigations being made in this interesting department of science, will settle this whole question with absolute certainty. Then shall we see these two compassing branches of human life brought together like concentric circles, to rest on one common central point.

Aristotle appears to have recorded the classification prevalent in his time and in still earlier times, when he informs us that the older physiognomists decided of a person's character by the resemblance of his features to "those of nations who differ in appearance, and manners, as the Egyptians, Thracians and Scythians." By the first he no doubt means the negro race; for besides the impossibility of his omitting this in speaking of the varieties in the human species, in another place he evidently confounds the two; saying that persons who are very dark are also timid, being referred to the Egyptian and Ethiopian race." The very interesting and complicated question whether the ancient Egyptian was formed on the type of the negro? here presents itself. Aristotle maintains the affirmative of the question, as we have seen. His theory of such an identity has been contested by the celebrated Blumenbach, whose name at once reminds us of a chief-magistrate in the united kingdom of Natural science. He contends that all the remains of the Egyptians oppose the statements of the classics, who seem to coincide with Aristotle. The painted representations on monuments according to this great naturalist always represent the Egyptians painted of a red or tawny color, with long streaming hair; while we often see the negroes represented beside them, with a jet black color, frizzled hair, and perfect Negro features, precisely as they really are at the present day. This theory is still farther sustained by the mummies themselves excavated after the lapse of many centuries. The skulls of these, as Mr. Laurence observes, invariably have the European, without a trace of the Negro feature.

The solution to these contradictory statements, may best be made by the supposition that the Grecians saw the inhabitants

of Central Africa in Egypt who had flocked there to serve as tributaries in the army, and thus were led to confound them with the indigenous population. The next upon the list are the Scythians, who compose the Germanic tribes, which were found scattered over the whole of Scythia. Besides the representations of them on monuments, the descriptions of them by Ovid in his exile present all the traits of the ancient Germans. Thus their hair is described as yellow or light colored, and as always unshorn. The third race of men enumerated by Aristotle in his classification consists of the Thracians. This corresponds to the olive or Mongul, the only one wherewith he must have been acquainted that finds no place in his enumeration. Aristotle being guided chiefly by color in his classification, and having given us the extremes, must intend to represent by this an intermediate, differing somewhat however from the Grecian complexion. Again: Homer has described the Thracians as ἀνέστροφος, or as having their hair only on the crown of the head. This seems opposed to the description given us of the Grecian or Germanic fashion, which rather cherished an abundant growth of hair, but is a very striking characteristic of Kalmuck costume, wherein as in that of many other Mongul nations, the head is shaved and only a tuft or tress of hair is left on the crown.

Other reflections such as the prevalence of *Shamanism* in the religion of Thessaly, and the origin of *Equestrianism*, attributed in fable to the same century, indicate a relationship with the race now occupying northern and central Asia.

For many ages this classification as proposed by Aristotle continued current, until the multiplication of intermediate shades of complexion made the system too complicated, and too clumsy for use. According to that theory the human race might be considered to be divided like the earth it inhabited, into three grand geographical divisions or zones; the very white occupying the colder regions; the black inhabiting the torrid—and the more fair the temperate region.

The first who proposed a new method for this important study was Governor Pownall. Though he adopted color as the basis of his classification, he yet suggested the propriety of attending to the conformation of the cranium in the various families of mankind. Camper however was the first, to lay down a canon for the determination of the configuration of heads. He united in his preparation for his work a perfect, practical knowledge of art, and an acquaintance with physiology and comparative anatomy. The skull is viewed by him in profile, and first a line is drawn from the entrance of the ear (the *meatus auditorius*) to

the basis of the nostrils ; then a second from the most prominent point of the forehead to the extreme border of the upper jaw, where the teeth are rooted (the alveolar process of the superior maxillary bone). The angle formed by the intersection of these two lines gives what is called the facial angle, and forms in Camper's system the specific characteristic of each human family.

To this system of measurement serious objections have been made by Blumenbach. He observes that there is a great vagueness in fixing the origin of lines as marked out by Camper ; but principally he objects that it is a measurement totally inapplicable to those races or families whose most marked distinctive, consists in the latitude of the skull rather than in the frontal projection.

It is to Blumenbach, a master mind in the department of Physiology, that we owe the system of classification, now almost universally followed. His museum contains the most complete and satisfactory collection of skulls in existence—and his works are a well filled store-house from which all must draw who wish to make progress in this study. Blumenbach has here achieved by extensive investigation and assiduous study, what Audubon has accomplished for Ornithology, or Baron von Humboldt for the entire field of Natural Science.

Blumenbach's classification is determined primarily by the contour of the cranium, and secondarily by the color of the hair, skin and iris. In his canon for the determination of the specific differences in the human race, particular attention is paid in the first place to the natural configuration of the skull ; and in the second place to the manner in which the *molar* or cheek-bones are connected with the *temporal* or bones at the ear, by means of an arch called the *zygoma* so formed as to allow strong muscles to pass under it, and be fixed to the lower jaw. In the construction of his rule, Blumenbach views the head in its natural position from above and behind ; and the relative proportions of the parts thus visible gives what he calls the vertical rule or *norma verticalis*. Trying the whole human race by this canon, he divides it into three principal families, with two intermediate ones. The three leading divisions he calls the Caucasian or central, secondly the Ethiopian, and thirdly the Mongul, or two extreme variations. In the Caucasian or as others have called it the Circassian, the skull is more symmetrical and the zygomatic arches enter into the general outline. In the Negro's skull you see the remarkable lateral compression of the forepart of the skull, by which the arches though themselves much flattened, yet come to protrude much beyond it. The

Mongul cranium is distinguished by the extraordinary breadth of its front, in which the zygomatic curvature is completely detached from the general circumference. Between the Caucasian variety and each of the extremes is an intermediate class, possessing in part the distinctives of the extremes, and forming a transition from the centre to them. That between the Caucasian and Negro families is the Malay; the link between the former and the Mongul is the American variety.

With this imperfect sketch of the different systems of classification we proceed straight-forward to the great problem to be solved, how could such varieties as we have seen, have taken their rise in the human species? Was it by some sporadic convulsion like those spoken of in Geology, in which the human race was torn asunder into several great branches; minor ones splintering off to account for exceptional and more isolated families, like the Coptic; or are we to suppose a gradual *degradation* as naturalists call it, whereby some nations or families passed gradually through successive shades, from one extreme to the other. Perhaps the present state of the science of Ethnography will not give us sufficient data to determine the *modus* in which these varieties, so clearly delineated, were originally formed. But waiving this question for the present, there exists no reasonable doubt as to the common origin of every race.

We shall endeavor to show both from analogy and direct examples; first that there is a tendency, even a struggling effort in Nature to raise up specific varieties in the human race; and secondly that these peculiarities may be propagated from father to son, and in succeeding generations may establish a distinctly marked family.

In the argument from analogy, if we take the vegetable kingdom, we find that each species takes its rise from some common centre whence it has gradually been propagated. This observation has led to a definite geographical division and distribution of plants. Twenty botanical provinces have been definitely laid out as inhabited by aboriginal or indigenous plants. This tendency of Nature to simplicity and unity in the origin of all things accounts for the fact, that when America was discovered not a single plant was found here, which was known in the old world, except such as could have had their seeds transmitted through the waters of the ocean.

We have here in the vegetable world an original unity, and a tendency to diversity under modifying influences.

The analogy between animals and man is still more applicable to the point in hand. The similarity between the physical

organization of both classes of animated being, and the identity of the laws by which the individuals and their races are preserved, furnish a strong argument from the actual contrarieties and differences of the one, to the possible modifications of the other.

Now it is evident that animals acknowledged to belong to one species, under modifying influences, change into varieties as wide apart and distinct as those in the human race. For instance, in regard to the contour of the cranium; the skulls of the mastiff and Italian greyhound are as different as those of the Negro and European. The skull of the wild boar too says Blumenbach differs widely from the tame swine's, its undisputed descendant,

Difference in color and texture of hair is also remarkable, and well worthy of observation. The ox of the Roman *compagna* is invariably grey, while in some other parts of Italy the breed is mostly red; swine and sheep are here also chiefly black, while in England white is their prevailing hue.

And also in the general form and structure of animals we find the greatest variations. This is very obvious in the ox, because of its great subjection to the influences of art, and domestication. What a contrast between the bulky, hardy long-horned animal which traverses the Roman streets, and the small-headed light-limbed breed, prized so highly by English farmers.

Dr. Prichard gives one very remarkable instance, that of a breed of sheep, reared within a very few years in England, and known by the name of the *ancon* or otter breed. It sprung up from a deformity in one animal, which communicated its peculiarities so completely to its progeny, that the breed is fully established.

These facts well authenticated, and many others which might be produced, present a strong argument of analogy applicable to the human species. If such distinctive varieties are formed and perpetuated by sporadic or gradual influences, in the unconscious animal existence, are not the possibilities for similar changes greater in the human race, possessed of self-directing activities?

But the question still remains to be settled, are there any direct examples, like those referred to in the vegetable and animal worlds, to be found in the human? One or two instances must suffice. For example, red hair is considered almost exclusively confined to the Caucasian family; yet individuals exist in almost every known variety with this peculiarity. Charlevoix observed it amongst the Esquimaux; Sonnerat, among the Papuans; Wallis among the Tahitans; and Lopes among the Negroes. Also amongst us are to be found individuals with frizzled hair

and a tendency towards other characteristics of the Ethiopian family.

Examples of more striking varieties are found among men than what constitute the specific characteristics of any race; such as the remarkable *porcupine-man*, traced through three generations in the family of Lambert; the albinos; and the variety consisting in supernumerary fingers. But there are extant, also, examples of whole nations having been so changed, giving us exemplifications of the afore-made deductions on a large scale. The Tartars and Monguls, on historical, traditional and philological grounds, are traceable to common origin; and yet it cannot be doubted, but that the extremes of the two nations, or families are as dissimilar as possible, and that the Tartars belong to the Caucasian race.

The race to which we belong presents a similar phenomenon. The language spoken from India to Iceland being essentially the same, proves the intermediate nations to be of common origin. The attempt has been made to account for this variation on the supposition, that the Indo-Germanic nations were saved from the deluge on two chains of mountains, the Himalaya and the Caucasus. From the former according to Klaproth, descended the Indians to the South and the Goths to the North; from the other came the Medes, Persians, and Pelasgians. This however is sheer conjecture, unsupported by historical proof or local tradition.

Now in view of the examples already adduced, taken from well authenticated facts, we can admit the possibility of a transition from one extreme color to the other, originally created by sporadic influences, and continued through the ordinary process of generation. We have not sufficient data to determine with unerring accuracy the original color of the human race. The prevailing opinion is that it was red, either because the name of the first man signifies in Hebrew that color, or, as Bishop Heber conjectures, because undomesticated animals tend towards it. Blumenbach supposes that the original color was white, inferable from the fact that every departure from this hue bears the mark of an excess, or a morbid affection. It has been clearly proved that the seat of the Negro's color is not in the skin which is as colorless in him as in us, but in the fine tissue situated under it, known in anatomy by the name of the tissue or net of Malpighi. The infant Negro is of a white hue immediately after birth, but is soon changed into its fixed type by the operation of some inherent law; which proves that the color is not original, but a subsequent abnormality. Some modifying spasmodic influence

with which we are uncognizant, must have originally formed this variation, which when once established has been perpetuated according to the laws of natural generation. The mystery, in which all subjects extending far back into dim antiquity are involved, preclude us from determining the causes which may have been in operation to produce the effects, which are so strikingly evident. Like the asymptotes of the hyperbola, the investigations of science are continually approximating to the given curve, but have not as yet come in contact with it. It may be contended here, as Hume maintained with reference to the question of miracles, that our experience testifying to the uniform operation of the laws of Nature, must preponderate over the probability of a suspension of, or variation from, those laws. But we must remember that the little segment of nature's cycle through which we have passed is an infinitesimal element, when referred to the world's great circle. Besides the laws which we know, other and far more active influences have been powerfully at work in the primordial stages of the world's vast process. There were times within the range of mythological history, when volcanoes raged in almost every chain of mountains; when seas filled to overflowing, leaped their boundaries and created new islands; when old lakes dried up, and new ones were formed; when besides the annual reproduction of plants and insects, Nature was engaged in producing the vaster and more massive elements of her sphere: when she toiled assiduously in her deep laboratories forming new and wonderful compositions; when besides the gradual continued operation of Nature's laws, other deep-moving agencies were busily at work. The relation between the general and individual forms of being and action seemed to call for such a two-fold action. Besides the natural and ordinary laws universally in operation during the period of infancy, the assimilating, digestive and absorbing functions causing the regularly progressive movement of the system, there is a plastic power at work traceable to no law of necessity, independent of the ordinary vital powers; which gives growth and solidity to the limbs; characteristic shape to the features, and development to the muscles. As the infantive state of existence is carried up to the full development of matured manhood, this indefinable power becomes inert, and withdraws its activity, until the decline and fall of old age, when it comes forward to undo its former work. The same thing is often observable during the prevalence of some epidemic, wherein the crisis in individual cases does not seem determined so much by the ordinary laws of the disease, as by the connection in which

the individual stands to the infected community. And so in like manner we have reason to believe, that in the infancy of the world's life, transient, sporadic influences were operative, of which we are at present unavoidably ignorant. When the world was slowly passing through a formative process, there existed greater room for the introduction of modifying influences than at present, when the laws and operations of Nature have become more fixed and regular. In man there may then have been some magnificent perturbing influence, like those grand convulsions spoken of by geologists. And is it not reasonable indeed to suppose, that those vast perturbations, taking place in the earth's material structure, should have their counterpart in man, standing by reason of his physical organization in such close proximity with Nature?

But we hasten on from the natural to the philological and moral argument in support of the unity of the human race.

Strong lexical and grammatical affinity of languages, cannot be the result of mere fortuitous circumstances, but proves some early relationship. Language consists in the external expression and arrangement of mental conceptions, according to certain syntactical rules. It is not made by the arbitrary adjustment of certain words, strung together like beads on a rosary. As the infant is born into social relations, so words (if we may be allowed the expression) *wake up* in the midst of grammatical connexions. A marked coincidence and similarity of different languages then, would seem to indicate an identity of mind and habit between those speaking them. The mind comes fully to a state of self-consciousness in the definite expression of its relation to the natural world, through its physical organization. This constituted the course of education through which Adam went, wherein the animals were made to pass before him in regular succession to see what he would call them; *and whatever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.* A similarity then in the grammatical structure of the languages of different nations must prove an intimate relationship between them. Philological investigations have tended to confirm, and support the Mosaic record, that all nations of the earth were originally "of one lip and of one speech." The relationship between Sanskrit and Greek is so marked and clear, that it could not possibly have been brought about by mere accident. A remarkable connexion between Hungarian, and the languages of Northern Europe, the Finnish, Lapponian, and Esthonian, has been solidly demonstrated; and the inspection of some ethnographic map will show how it is placed, like what

geologists call outliers of peculiar strata, as a mass dismembered and detached from the group to which it belongs.

But we must pass on to the argument drawn from the conception of humanity abstractly viewed; and from man's concrete moral powers. Every generic term involves a twofold conception; a practical diversity and difference, and a concrete union and unity. Whilst humanity implies a diversity of operations; there is at last but one Spirit. In developing itself into concrete life, it branches off into diversified shoots and ramifications, having but one common root and trunk. The outward features of distinct species of animals, is not greater, and more marked than their inherent dispositions; whilst in the most dissimilar states of social life, we find an approximation of feeling, a coincidence of sentiment, and a contemporaneousness of the whole moral nature, which proves that the faculty in man, corresponding to that of instinct in animals, is identical through the whole race. The term race itself is inapplicable to animals, and used in connexion with man, indicates the existence of a common centrality. The ferocity of the wolf and the cunningness of the fox; the gregarious and tumultuary aggression of the one, and the solitary pilfering of the other, reminds us of an absolute distinction in the animals themselves. But in man no such wide chasms are found. Though his nature in specific cases may have been vastly modified by different circumstances, yet one bond seems to unite all in indissoluble unity. Whether for ages he has dozed away his days in listlessness like the Asiatic in his Divan, or like the Red man has chased the nimble deer over his favored hunting-grounds, there is nothing in his organization to show that through education, and custom he might not have changed the one occupation for the other.

We cannot properly estimate the effect which sin has had, not only on our moral nature abstractly considered, but also through it on our mental and physical constitution. Man's normal state was in the image and after the likeness of God; reminding us of a correspondence between the faculties of man and God, and a harmonious co-operation of them with the Divine will. When through sin, man aberrated from his appointed orbit, there was no limit to the operation of that centrifugal force, save such as was revealed by the centripetal action of a promised Redeemer. "When man" says the learned Frederick Schlegel "had once fallen from virtue, no determinable limit could be assigned to his degradation, nor how far he might descend by degrees, and approximate even to the level of the brute;

for as from his origin he was a being essentially free, he was in consequence capable of change, and even in his organic powers most flexible. We must adopt this principle as the only clue to guide us in our inquiries from the Negro, who as well from his bodily strength and agility, as from his docile, and in general, excellent character, is far from occupying the lowest grade in the scale of humanity, down to the monstrous Patagonian, the almost imbecile Peshweris, and the horrible cannibal of New Zealand; whose very portrait excites a shudder in the beholder. So far from seeking with Rousseau and his disciples for the true origin of mankind, and the proper foundations of the social compact, in the condition even of the best and noblest savages, we regard it on the contrary, as a state of degeneracy and degradation." But the resuscitation and recreation of these ruined natures is brought to pass through the incarnate God, combining in his nature all the capacities and sensibilities of Humanity. In him is centered the fulness and perfection of human nature. What was lost in Adam is restored to man in Christ. But the organic union of the theanthropic Saviour with humanity, for its redemption and salvation, supposes homogeneity in its constituent elements. The possibility of making provision for the redemption of all mankind in one God-man, rested on the fact that all specific characteristics grew from one common origin. On the supposition that there is no organic connection between the fallen angels, their redemption could not have taken place through a single incarnation; so neither could there have been an organic salvation for man, unless all men have originated from one common source. Such a necessary circumscription of the atonement would have released all beyond its influence, from the solemn obligations thereby imposed.

Thus all the reasonings drawn from the idea of Humanity, and the central person in whom that conception has been fully realized; as well as many well established facts gathered from the natural history of man, lend a strong table of testimony to the Mosaic record.

Having been brought by our thread of argumentation to the Person of the Saviour of the world, we will here, make in conclusion one general observation, applicable also to the point in hand.—The manner in which the Evangelists draw the natural portrait of the Saviour, stamps upon the Gospel history a strong internal proof of a superior authority. They do not construct Christ after the model of a great Jewish Teacher like Hillel or Gamaliel, personifications of concrete ideas among the Jews. The moral characteristics and whole expression in these differ-

ent representations are far apart from each other. The thoughts, principles, feelings and springs of moral action, as depicted in the person and character of Christ have nothing in common with those of Rabbi Samuel. No person with a single eye would take them to be pictures of the same countenance and person. This then is the impregnable inference. If two painters of different temperament and habit should embody their ideas of excellence and beauty in precisely the same forms, would we not infer that the one had copied from and imitated the other? Seeing then the perfect coincidence between the representations of the Evangelists, the only fair conclusion is that they all had in view more than a great Jew ; and that they referred to the same living original person Jesus Christ. Thus have the inspired writers stamped on their record the seal of a supernatural origin, and challenge our firm faith in it. The inspired word is supported by the revelations of Science at every point in which they come in contact ; and all the modern scientific researches instead of creating any distrust in the Bible, confirm and strengthen our faith therein. The still progressing disclosures of the mysterious operations of the intricate laws of the natural world, will present to us the word of God in harmony with all his fearful and wonderful works ; and the depths which now serve to conceal Nature's darkest mysteries, like the cavern temples of India and Idumea, will be changed into the fittest places for adoration. Man will soon penetrate into the inmost sanctuary of Nature, and there find the living law to be honored and obeyed.

Trenton, N. J.

F. D. S.

THE VERNAL ODES OF HORACE.

How heartily doth the old Venusian bard enter into his descriptions of the Spring! The gentle movings of that season he seemeth to feel in his inmost soul. He resembleth not some of our modern city poetasters who, having never caught inspiration from the fields and woods themselves, draw their descriptions merely from gardens or what they have read of in books. Such Bavii and Mævii he, no doubt, as utterly detested in his day as we do them in ours. He resembleth not much even some of our best modern descriptive poets, who delineate the features of nature as faithfully as a landscape painter, it is true, but in the same objective manner. Hanging on the outward beauties of these with their eyes, their imaginations become warmly impressed, and they are thus enabled to give charming descriptions of them in their poems. But after all, these are only pictures. Beautiful things to be looked upon, to be sure, but still the poet is not visibly present. He uttereth not in them his emotions. Horace was no bad hand at plain sketching of this sort himself; as any one knoweth who hath read his *Epistles*, as, for instance, the Sixteenth of the First Book, but he seemeth to have considered it no very great accomplishment in itself. Of his country villa he there giveth us a fine description, it is true, but it serveth only as a frontispiece or introduction to some more important moral lessons. In the ode he goeth further. He entereth there into full sympathy with reviving nature in the Spring and sendeth forth his voice as naturally and as feelingly as a bird its warblings. In this species of song he excelleth. How few lyrics have we now-a-days called forth by the genial influences of the season! In such odes he entereth not far into the mere description of the landscape. The scene is too joyous to be described. Amid the glad burstings forth of the leaves and blossoms and the songs of the birds, by his vivid imagination, all the loves and beauties and graces are seen in their living human forms coming forward in dancing activity, personified according to the mythology of his country. He cannot keep quiet. In lyric strains he inviteth his friends to come abroad with him into the country and perform their appropriate parts in the grand oratorio of the season; to wreath around their unguented heads the festive chaplets, and to sacrifice to Faunus, the old Italian frolic god of rural nature. Of course it becometh not our modern poets to revive the mythology of ancient Greece and Rome. We live under the cheering influences of a holier religion. Still

methinketh it would be wise to follow their example in one respect. We ought to unite with nature more heartily than we do in her orisons and vespers. We confine our praises too entirely to temples and houses made with hands. The woods and meadows now-a-days we leave to laud their great Reviver alone. Our climate, to be sure, is more inclement than was that of the Romans. Spring doth not burst upon us so soon nor so suddenly as it hath ever done on the more favored people of Italy. Their scenery too is perhaps more picturesque and beautiful. Still we fancy that in the Spring, enough of life and beauty is to be seen around us to awaken more warmly than it doth our feelings of devotion and gratitude. The vernal festive day of the Romans in honor of Faunus was celebrated on the thirteenth of February. With us we have no holiday of the sort until the first of May, when the young villagers in some sections of our country go abroad and perform their gambols around their may-pole, and choose their queen, and crown her with flowers; a charming old observance which hath come down to us from simpler times, and the day, I trust, will never be suffered to pass without its appropriate rites, as it is now the only one in the calendar set apart for holding sympathetic communion with reviving nature; though I must confess that I have never yet been able to discover very much religion beneath its observances.

HORACE. BOOK I, ODE IV.

Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,
 Trahuntque siccas machinae carinas.
 Ac neque jam stabulis gaudet pecus, aut arator igni;
 Nec prata canis albicant pruinis,
 Jam Cytherea choros ducit Venus, imminente Luna:
 Junctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
 Alternò terram quatunt pede; dum graves cyclopum
 Vulcanus ardens urit officinas.
 Nunc decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto,
 Aut flore, terrae quem ferunt solutae.
 Nunc et in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis,
 Seu poscat agna, sive malit haedo.
 Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas
 Regumque tures. O beate Sexti,
 Vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat inchoare longam.
 Jam te premet nox, fabulaeque Manes,
 Et domus exilis Plutonia: quo simul mearis,
 Nec regna vini sortiere talis,
 Nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet juvenus
 Nunc omnis et mox virgines tepebunt.

Solved is winter severe by the changing of spring and bland Favonius.
 And by machines the dry-keeled ships are drawn down ;
 While in the fold now joys not the flock nor the ploughman at the
 Nor meadows longer are bedight with hoar frost. [fireside,
 Now Cytherea her dances is leading up 'neath the hanging full moon;
 And joined with Nymphs the Graces all becoming [cyclops
 Trill on the earth their lightest alternate steps ; whilst of heavy
 The glowing Vulcan kindleth up the forges. [myrtle
 Now 'tis comely to wreath round the glossy head either sprigs of
 Or flowers which all the loosened lands are bearing.
 Now in the fresh-leaved grove 'tis comely to sacrifice to Faunus,
 If lamb he ask, or kid he would have rather. [tage
 Pale Death beateth with foot impartially 'gainst the poor man's cot-
 And king's proud tower. O my happy Sext'us,
 Life's sum soon to be filled forbiddeth our casting forward long hopes.
 Soon night will press thee and the fabled Manes, [go'st
 And the Plutonian, exiled dwelling-place ; whither when thou once
 Nor chief at wine shalt thou be made by dices
 Nor shalt thou gaze on thy beautiful Lycidas ; pleased with whom
 the youths are,
 And soon the virgins will be all enamoured.

Our bard, we confess, towards the conclusion of this ode waxeth somewhat pensive and sombre. He doth not enter into the full enjoyment of the present without any regard to the future. In his day he was not just "a butterfly born in a bow-er." He was not even one of those gay Grecians of old who boasted themselves to have been born the brothers of the cicadae or harvest flies. They sipped the dew of the present. They sang and danced and never thought of looking forward to the coming winter. Anacreon, for instance, in his ode on the Spring, and in fact in all his odes, chirpeth as merrily and as carelessly as a cricket. He revelleth in the "liquid noon" of the present. Into the dim vista of the future he never looketh further forward than he can see wine and women and roses. He observeth not approaching evils, until the ladies tell him that his hair is becoming white and thin ; and then, to kill care, he danceth and singeth and sippeth wine, until at length in his green old-age he is suddenly choked off by a grape-stone.

Φῶς γίγνεται τερπνόν,
 Φῶς φίλον χορεύσας,
 Γίγνεται δ' ἔσται χορεύου,
 Τερπνὸς γίγνεται μελέων.
 Τὰς δὲ φρένας νεύζω.

I love an old man sprightly,
 I love a youthful dancer,
 But when an old man danceth,
 In hair he is an old man,
 In heart he is a youngster.

Our bard is of a graver mood. With all his cheerfulness he hath about him too much of the stern Roman dignity to be cutting up such fandangoes. He feareth not to look forward at evils coming before they oppress him. The sombre thoughts of these he loveth even to blend with his present enjoyments, and thus, as by adding acids to sweet beverages, he maketh them more palatable. He pointeth to the dark clouds of the future as to a sort of back-ground, to set off more vividly by contrast the joyous light of the present. Of course we do not approve of his religion and philosophy. These were, however, no doubt, in his day the best that the old heathen could lay his hands upon. At any rate, they suited very well his taste and disposition. In our more favored times, with the joys of immortality revealed, the future is lightened up too splendidly to serve any longer as a back-ground. The devout moralist now-a-days very properly describeth all earthly joys as being unsatisfying and evanescent in their nature, while only those of heaven are substantial. Still, we think we should not entirely overlook the Spring. Our emotions should rise in sympathy with the universal concert of nature on the occasion. It behooveth us to read her moral and religious lessons set forth in their freshest print. The day commemorative of our Saviour's resurrection, we think not without divine intention at first, falleth in this joyous season of the year when all nature is putting forth new life and beauty; and to us it really seemeth wrong that it should be suffered to pass away, as it now always is, without any appropriate observances. But, sweet bard of old, strike up thy lyre again and let us have another vernal ode.

HORACE, BOOK IV, ODE VII.

*Diffugere nives; redeunt jam gramina campis,
 Arboribusque comae:
 Mutat terra vices: et decrescentia ripas
 Flumina praetereunt:
 Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet
 Ducere nuda choros.
 Immortalia ne speres monet Annus et alium
 Quae rapit Hora diem.*

Frigora mitescunt Zephyris: Ver proterit Aestas,
 Interitura, simul
 Pomifer Auctumnus fruges effuderit: et mox
 Bruma recurrit iners.
 Damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae;
 Nos, ubi decidimus,
 Quo pius Aeneas, quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
 Pulvis et umbra sumus.
 Quis scit, an adjiciant hodiernae crastina summae
 Tempora Dî superi?
 Cuncta manus avidas fugient haeredis, amico
 Quae dederis animo.
 Quum semel occideris. et de te splendida Minos
 Fecerit arbitria:
 Non, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te
 Restituet pi-tas.
 Infernis neque enim tenebris Diana pudicum
 Liberat Hippolytum:
 Nec Laethaea valet Theseus abrumperé caro
 Vincula Pirithoo.

[grasses.
 Fled all off have the the snows: coming back to the fields are the
 And to the forests their leaves:
 Lands sweet change undergo: and streams late swollen subsiding
 Peacefully flow by their banks: [adventures
 Knit with the nymphs and her sisters twain now the Grace forth
 Naked to lead up the dance.
 Immortality not to expect, thee teacheth the Year and
 Hours bearing off the bright day. [Summer;
 Colds are quelled by the zephyrs; the Spring then is trampled by
 She to depart also when
 Bountiful Autumn his fruits shall have spread, and presently Winter
 Sluggish is on us again.
 Moons nathless passing rapid repair still their heavenly losses;
 We, when we suddenly drop
 Whither did pious Aeneas and whither rich Tullus and Ancus,
 Ashes and shadows become.
 Who know'th whether the gods supreme may add to this day's sum
 Hours of tomorrow or not? [spendest
 All shall escape thine heirs clutched hand which at present thou
 On the delights of thyself.
 When thou once hast departed and on thee, uttered by Minos,
 Hath been the lucid decree,
 Not, Torquatus, thy race, not thee thine eloquence, not thy
 Piety back will restore.
 For from the darkness beneath could Diana never recover

Virtuous Hippolytus :
 Nor his bonds Lethæan to break was Theseus able
 For his dear Pirithous.

Sweet moralist, thou certainly knewest best what was most besuiting to thy times and people ; but to my modern fancy, I must confess, thy prospective views appear often too dark and lowering. They seem almost to overshadow and overwhelm the joyous present. Thy moral lessons are good enough in their way, but, for the sake of variety, if it please thee, let us hear a strain a little more Anacreontic. Sextius and Torquatus were most worthy personages. It besuited thee to address them in verses serious and majestic. They were rich and noble and thou wast comfortably poor. I have no doubt but that thy moral warnings, at any rate on the latter eloquent and pious gentleman, had their proper influence. Thou didst induce him by thy strains, I feel persuaded, to draw forth the good old wine which, I fear, he kept before too close beneath his many keys, to sparkle in the joyous light, on the festive board, to the great consolation and delight of thyself his welcome guest, but to the no small chagrin and discomfit, I fancy, of his expectant heir. Still, we would fain have a strain from thee less moralizing and state-ly, more sprightly and jocose. Hadst thou not some friend and companion more intimate and close whom thou couldst therefore address in a style more familiar and mirthful? Methinketh somewhere hereabouts in this fourth book is a song somewhat in this humor. Let me turn over a few leaves. Yes, here it is! That exquisite ode which thou didst indite and send on a pleasant Spring morning to thy friend and fellow poet Virgilius Maro, to invite him to a picknick ; he to furnish the nard on the occasion and thou the wine.

HORACE, BOOK IV, ODE XII.

Jam veris comites, quæ mare temperant,
 Impellunt animæ linteæ Thraciæ :
 Jam nec prata rigent, nec fluvii strepunt
 Hiberna nive turgida

Nidum ponit, Ityn flebiliter gemens
 Infelix avis, et Cecropiæ domus
 Aeternum opprobrium, quod male barbaras
 Regum est ulta libidines.

Dicunt in tenero gramine pinguum
 Custodes ovium carmina fistula,

Delectantque deum, cui pecus et nigri
Colles Arcadiæ placent.

Adduxere sitim tempora, Virgili:
Sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum
Si gestis, juvenum nobilium cliens,
Nardo vina mereberis.

Nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum,
Qui nunc Sulpiciis accubitis horreis
Spes donare novas largus, amaraque
Curarum eluere efficax.

Ad quæ si properas gaudia, cum tua
Velox merce veni: non ego te meis
Immunem meditor tingere poculis,
Plena dives ut in domo.

Verum pone moras et studium lucri;
Nigrorumque memor, dum licet, ignium,
Misce stultitiam consiliis brevem:
Dulce est desipere in loco.

Now Spring's wandering sprites, which do the seas becalm,
Are out swelling the sails, breezes from Thracia:
Now nor meadows are stiff nor do the rivers roar
High swoln from the late winter's snow.

Her nest fashions the bird wretchedly sad that mourns
Itys and the reproach pressing eternally
Her Cecropian race, since they did vengeance take
Too deep on the rude lust of kings.

Reclined on the new grass, keepers of thriving sheep
Are discoursing their songs set to their rustic pipes,
And thus pleasing the god, whom do the flocks and dark
Hills Arcadian gratify.

Thirst this season brings on, O my Virgilius:
But if fain you would quaff wine that is generous,
Pressed at Cales, the best, client of noble youths,
For nard well shall you merit it.

Of nard one little vase out shall deduce a cask
Which now snugly is hid in the Sulpician cells,
New hopes rich to bestow also to wash away
Sharp cares most efficacious.

To these joys if inclined, come with yourself, in haste,
Your club bearing along; never a thought I have
That you free, from my cups I should be moistening,
Like some lord of a wealthy house.

But now doff your delays and the desire of gain;
And bethinking of pyres gloomy, while yet you may,
Blend some foolishness brief with your most wise designs:
Sweet 'tis loose to let, in its place.

Many thanks to thee, kind-hearted and social bard! At my present writing the season is still unconfirmed. The sap, I am persuaded by the genial zephyrs, is beginning to be stirred within the trees, but as yet no leaves hath it sent forth from the boughs, not even from those of the sprightly willows by the brooks, and in the meadows as yet the glossy black bird of the crimsoned shoulders hath not adventured to emit his mellowed notes; but by turning mine ear to thy strains, called forth by the season, and attempting to render them into corresponding English rhythms—alas! losing thereby how much of their beauty!—I have nevertheless succeeded in wooing around me the fancies of a fully present Spring. How amaranthine are the genuine flowers of poesie! Of a distant clime and remote age, long since departed bard, before the christian era, thy poems yet breathe a freshness and spirit of beauty, and come home to us with a warmth of feeling in closer harmony with surrounding nature than those of many a modern songster.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

PRACTICAL EXEGESIS.

[From an article by *Neander* in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift* of Berlin, for February, 1850.]

ERRORS which have long reigned over men's minds can be properly overcome, only when the truth which underlies them is known and acknowledged, and the want from which they spring is made to understand itself and so finds the way to its true and proper satisfaction. This holds in particular of errors that are connected with the sphere of religion. And not unfrequently may we see that false views have sprung from the unconscious mingling together of different regions of life or knowledge, both of which have their rights, while it is only by scientific consideration at the same time that they can be fairly distinguished and held apart. Such is the case with the interests of scientific and practical exegesis. Practical exegesis is something absolutely necessary for the progress of theology and church life, as it serves to mediate between the Divine word in the form of history and its relation to the present time, setting science in union with actual life and theory with practice; and we find accordingly something akin to it, or at least an effort towards it, proceeding out of the christian spirit from the beginning. But this still only in such a way that it had no proper sense of its own nature and design, no clear view of its own office, but was led rather to confound this with something else. Must we not acknowledge this to have been the case in what was called the allegorical mystical interpretation of the Bible, in the assumption of a manifold sense as lying at the bottom of its revelations? The two spheres, of what is to be styled strictly the exposition of the Scriptures and of what pertains to their practical application, fell here unconsciously into one another. The two objects, to explore the objective sense of the Divine word, and to bring this home through various applications to the present time, were not kept clearly distinct, but ran together with more or less confusion, making it impossible for either to be pursued with any right and full success. In order to this, it was necessary that there should be first a clear conscious separation of the different mental activities here in question.

When in the seventeenth century a onesided doctrinal interest, in the Lutheran church of Germany, had drawn all its own way, and the interest for exegetical study was thus completely thrust aside, an attempt was made to revive this last by pressing simply its practical importance. Over against the onesided scientific

tendency rose a onesided zeal for practice. Practical exegesis claimed to be everything. It was proposed to have the fruit, without the use of the intermediate labor required to procure it from the fruit bearing tree. We may apply to the case the beautiful words of Clement of Alexandria, where he speaks of those who expected the produce of the vine at once, without the pains which becomes the good husbandman going before. "The Lord is allegorically the vine, from which with care and skilful culture fruit is to be obtained; we must prune, dig, bind up the branches, and do all else that the case requires, in order that this may appear for our use."¹ Where science and art, such as the interpretation of an ancient author requires, had not been applied under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, it was not possible to reach the objective sense of the Divine word. For what holds in the case of any other ancient author, must hold of God's word in the sacred scriptures also after it has once submitted itself to the law of human language. And the objective sense of the word when thus found also could not be brought into right practical relation to the present, without the employment of all those aids of thought and reason which are needed for such a transfer from one form to the other. This is what we are to regard in Clement's sense as the work of the vine dresser, which is required in order that we may enjoy the fruit of the vine. Even when a distinction was made between scientific exegesis and practical, and the first was held in honor, there was still always a want of insight into the right relation between them. The line of transition from one to the other was not scientifically determined. And as the practical exegesis lost itself in subjective arbitrariness, the scientific on the other hand became too formal and inanimate, as not being of a nature to open the way for the application of its results to actual life, a business requiring indeed a different art. Or if the scientific interest at times did seek, in compliance with the feeling of practical need, to draw the other art at once into its own service, the exegesis became overladen with foreign matter, which was often brought in also in a purely violent way and had no growth whatever from the subject.

It is well known how in what was called practical exposition, there was often to be found indeed the expression of pious thoughts and feelings, suited to have some religious effect upon the reader; while however it was still too generally only an accidental connection, resting in the mere conceit of the interpre-

¹ Strom. lib. 1, 9.

ter, which thus prevailed after all between such application and the real objective meaning of the word from which it was drawn. The reflections and feelings brought into view were just such as had risen in a devotional and pious mind, when employed with the contemplation of a particular portion of scripture, and in this view they might be altogether true and good, nay the product even of gracious influence from the Spirit attending the prayerful study of the word; but still they were not the very sense of the word itself brought to bear on existing relations. It was always the subjective standpoint or frame of the expositor that here took the lead, not the Divine word itself as a revelation for all times, and as having force for the present also only through its capability of being the oracle at the same time of every other age. By disregarding the historical conditions of the word, in its application to the present time, exposition often ran out into tedious latitude, as we find it particularly in the so called Pietistic period, in which the German language had lost so much of Luther's vigorous and marrowy style, and German culture generally had become so prosy and flat. With what was truly edifying also there was a continual mixture of shallow insipidity, from an effort to improve practically that which only needed to be rightly understood and applied, to carry along with it at once the richest force in this form. Thus it is that what is termed practical exegesis has fallen not without reason into bad repute, and seems especially not to be on good terms with cultivated taste.

Afterwards followed the so-called moral interpretation of the Rationalistic school, which lacked in addition all sympathy with the true sense of the Divine word and stood in an order of thought wholly opposed to it, pretending morally to produce first that which is itself the only fountain and source of all morality. Yet even here there lay at the bottom some truth, only to be reached however in a different way, the idea namely and the necessity also of a really practical use of the Bible.

Practical exegesis, as appears from what has already been said, has for its necessary condition that which is rigidly scientific and according to art. This requires in the case of any author not simply linguistic but also historical knowledge; and along with the first, without which no exposition can succeed, the last forms especially the necessary basis of all sound application of the word to actual life. Every fact of literature, every word once spoken or written, belongs to history, and can be rightly understood only in its historical relations. We must seek to ascertain, what the writer or speaker meant to say under these

determinate connections and conditions. Only so can we reach the true sense of the words. To be able to do this, we must translate ourselves into the very circumstances of the time when the words were spoken or written, into the special relation of the speaker or writer to the particular circle addressed by him, as though we had before us a man of our own age. We must seek to be at home in the time concerned, as truly as we are in our own. This requires manifold studies having for their object the lively presentation of past history, and it requires also a special historical sense. Both must go together. The historical sense or tact will not be sufficient without the toil of study; but all learning too, acquired by study, will be in vain, without the historical sense, partly an original peculiar gift in the case of some and partly the result of proper cultivation. So long now as no right account was made of these indispensable requisites for all scientific exposition, it was not possible for practical exegesis to come to any prosperous development. When the Bible was viewed simply as a written revelation of the Holy Ghost, without regard to differences of time, men, and historical data generally; so long as only the one voice of the Spirit was heard to speak, as though the inspiration which prompted its authors to write put thoughts into them also in a given form; so long as the human persons of the writers themselves were not heard to speak, under the force of real human relations actually their own, as free organs of the Spirit with which they were actuated; there was no room in truth to think, either of an exposition answerable to the demands of art and science, or of the practical application of this in any fair way to present circumstances and present wants. It was necessary to open the way first to the right idea of all sound biblical interpretation, by distinguishing properly between the two factors that come together in the constitution of the Divine word as we have it in the Scriptures, before it was possible to proceed from this to the right use of it for practical purposes. The old mechanical theory of inspiration either made such sound practical exegesis impossible, or at least hindered and embarrassed it greatly. If God's revelation however was spoken not for one time only, but in speaking to a past period was designed to speak at the same time to all following periods, and so to the present also among others, it follows that to understand it in this last view we must necessarily first inquire, what the Holy Ghost in choosing such and such organs, so conditioned and circumstanced, and in allowing them to speak under such and such given historical relations, designed to say for that particular time, what precise sense the revelation

carried for those to whom it was first addressed. That is in other words, we must try to understand according to the laws of historical knowledge, what these particular organs of the Holy Ghost, in virtue of their individual peculiarities and their special posture in the living bosom of their own time, had it in their mind to say. Then first can we see, how God in speaking at one time, in proclaiming his revealed truth with practical adaptation to the circumstances of a given age, has at the same time spoken by this to our age also, since the truth carries in it always a similar relation to the laws and fundamental properties and wants of human nature. To get at this sense for our own time, we need only thus to derive the general from the particular, so as to reduce it again to the form of a particular application to the existing state of things. As both propositions are true, that there is nothing new under the sun, and that yet all must renew itself perpetually, we will need only to recognize the type of the present in that past which the organs of the Divine word addressed in speaking or writing, in order to apply it to the present time.

This however requires also that we should have a right knowledge and understanding of the present itself; for which we are to find the key in ourselves, as being in our own life united with the present and carrying in us its fundamental features, as we carry in us indeed an image of universal humanity. The case demands thus that we should be well acquainted with ourselves, and that we should descend with the Divine light into the interior depths of our own being, so as by self-knowledge to find the key for the knowledge of our age and time. We must have applied the contents of God's word first to ourselves, in order to be able to apply them to the world with which we find ourselves surrounded. As we must bring the time of the apostles before us in a present way by proper historical knowledge, in order to satisfy the requirements of scientific exposition, so must we have come to a thorough understanding of our own time also in its historical development, to be able to make the word of God a true word for its use. It must become clear to us, how the same apostle, who in relation to the practical and theoretical questions of his own day as the inspired organ of the Holy Ghost speaks thus and thus, would utter himself were he now at hand in relation to the questions of our day. It must be as though we heard him actually speaking himself, and what we expound to others should make an impression on them as if they heard the apostle himself speaking in their midst; not as if we could presume to compare ourselves with such a man of God, but just because

we try to leave our own personality wholly behind, and by the various helps of science and life already mentioned seek to apply to our time only the objective force of the Divine word whose organs the sacred writers were, not saying anything new, not adding anything of our own, not putting anything into the word; as is the case with those strained attempts at spiritualization, which read into the text rather than read out of it, and in which the effort is, however unconsciously, rather to glorify self, than to let the word take its own simple and profoundly majestic course. What we aim at in the method here proposed, is just to guard against the danger of a too subjective tendency, so as to draw out the treasures that lie in the depths of the word itself, and to bring them forth in fresh view to the living sense of the present. We aim to let the word speak through us, rather than to speak ourselves. We try, for example, to recognize in the difficulties of the Corinthian church the difficulties of our own time; and when we have succeeded, by all the means of science and art before noticed, in understanding properly what the apostle Paul says of the questions belonging to his own day, and how he deals with them, we will be able to reproduce his presence, as though we heard him speak and saw him act among the questions and difficulties also of the present time. It was thus, to borrow an example from another sphere, that the great historian and statesman Niebuhr knew how to read the present in the past, and to make the truths of past history of living force for his own age. So must the practical expositor understand, how to bring the apostolical period by proper historical reduction into union with that in which he himself lives. And in this practical application we may not stop simply with the truths expressly spoken by the inspired writers; the consequences also which flow from these, so far as they can be shown to be well grounded, are to be regarded as part of the revelation, and ought to be included accordingly in our application. In this way, keeping the different departments of knowledge asunder, and making proper account at once of their difference and their unity, we may bring truly to pass that which we see other forms of exegesis struggling after from the beginning, but which for the reasons already assigned has not been heretofore fully reached, at least not so far as regards the art of practical exposition.

Let us now cast a look on the New Testament itself, to see if we can find here countenance for the idea of what we have been thus far describing. We notice first the words of our Lord himself, when he compares a scribe rightly instructed for the kingdom of God to a householder, who brings forth from his

treasure things new and old, (Matth. xiii: 52), and who thus by such alternation of old and new pleases and excites his hearers, by attaching the new to the old finds for it more ready acceptance, makes the old to appear new and the new old. Our Lord says this here particularly in reference to the parables, which by the very fact of their answering to this rule, are suited to bring clearly before men truths that are new to them, and also to facilitate their comprehension. But the declaration is not to be confined certainly to *such* instruction, valued as it was by the Saviour especially on this account; it contains rather a general rule for the regulation of the teacher in the service of the kingdom of God. Every form of instruction, which in conformity with this law teaches the right knowledge and use of the mysteries of the kingdom of God, may be regarded as having here accordingly the commendation of the Lord himself. And especially must this hold of practical exegesis, which as we have shown is suited above all for setting the new in connection with the old, and for causing the old to become for us new and young.

Again we reckon as here in point the warning of the apostle Paul (1 Cor. x: 11) to the Corinthian christians, who were disposed to indulge a vain self-confidence and false security, relying too much on the fact of their past conversion, their incorporation into the Lord's body by baptism and their continued fellowship with it through the holy supper; a warning drawn from the example of that great mass of the ancient Israelites, who all followed the conduct of Moses, enjoyed the same Divine mercy in the passage of the Red Sea, were united together by the same covenant seals, while yet only a very few of them ever reached the land of promise. The punishment with which the nation generally was visited for its unfaithfulness and disobedience, should serve as an admonition to those who considered themselves in secure connection with the new christian theocracy, and so came short in its proper terms of fidelity, obedience and self-denial. What else now is this method of the apostle than what we have been describing as practical exegesis; in the past to read the present, and from the Divine conduct in relation to another age to draw the truth that is to be applied to the parallel relations of the age now passing? The way in which God formerly acted towards his people, is used as doctrine for the people of God in the time then present. And whilst Paul so applies this example out of the history of the ancient covenant people, he brings out himself the rule and method according to which the Scriptures generally are to be applied to a later time; for he says: "All these things happened unto them for exam-

ples, and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." This implies the canon, that what has been written for the past we are to consider as written also for ourselves. Paul speaks thus of the Old Testament, as related to those who had experienced the coming in of the new covenant as the close of God's kingdom upon the earth. We may however apply it in the same way, and with still greater force, to the relation of the apostolical period to ours, inasmuch as our connection with the life of the early christian church is one of far greater nearness and unity.

The apostle, in another place, speaks against the undue valuation put upon the gift of tongues; one that was suited to attract much attention, and was more flattering to spiritual vanity than the gift of generally intelligible edifying discourse, which went under the name of prophecy in the apostolical age. Paul could not fail to disapprove of this judgment. He would restrain rather the use of the gift of tongues, as being of less account for the purposes of general edification. Only then should it be employed, when there was a capacity at the same time along with it to translate its generally unintelligible utterances into the form of common language. On the other hand he recommended so much the more the awakening discourse supplied by the gift of prophecy, as being suited to promote the spiritual benefit both of such as were already believers and of others also favorably disposed for religion, who attended the christian meetings out of curiosity or from some rising concern for their own salvation. To represent to the Corinthians now the absurdity of their judgment, he appeals (1 Cor. xiv : 21, 22) to the passage Isaiah xxviii : 11; where God threatens the Jews, that because they refused to hear the prophets speaking his will plainly to them, and calling them to repentance, in their own language, he would withdraw from them this voice of instruction and warning, and address them in tones of holy indignation through nations of foreign barbarous tongue sent against them as the instruments of his justice. This the apostle applies to the circumstances of the Corinthian church, and to the gift of tongues as compared with that of prophecy. As the nations speaking in unintelligible tongues sent to those addressed by the prophet were a sign of the Divine displeasure, so must it be taken as a sign of the same thing towards stiff necked unbelievers, who refused to hearken to the direct appeals of christian exhortation, when they found themselves left in a christian meeting to the mere sound of tongues which they had no power to understand; just as the parables, for those who *would* not understand them, were to be

a sign of their own condemnation for such ignorance. In this sense Paul says, that the use of tongues is a sign, not for believers, among whom he here reckons also such as are in the way to faith, but for unbelievers, those who have no heart to believe. He applies thus the general thought which lies in the passage from Isaiah, to the particular circumstances of the Corinthian congregation, what was true of foreign nations addressing the Israelites as the instruments of God's wrath, as compared with the prophets who had addressed them in their own tongue, to the case of the New Testament prophesyings as compared with the gift of tongues. To do this in detail was the business of practical exegesis. It required special scientific links and connections, to bring over the true historical sense of Isaiah's words in their immediate primary application, to the new application made of them by the apostle. The apostle however, having in his eye only the practical purpose immediately in hand, springs over all these intermediate links which it is the duty of science to explore. In the discharge of this duty thus, we learn from his example.

We notice farther the way, in which the apostle (Rom. iv : 3) quotes Abraham as an example and pattern of justification by faith. Paul applies here what was contained in a divine fact of the primitive history of the O. T. theocracy, to believers under the Gospel. We learn from the example of Abraham, that the distinguishing characteristic of the righteous is always only faith. By this man renounces himself, rises above himself, gives himself up to God's self-revelation, resigns himself to his way and will; and so it is the only condition, by which it is possible for man to become what the will of God concerning him requires. It is on the side of man the act of apprehension by which he appropriates what God offers and gives. So Paul applies the words in Genesis, that to Abraham his faith was counted for righteousness. Abraham was just as little as any other man sinlessly and absolutely righteous; but this his faith, as the only possible and indispensable means of receiving what is divine on the part of man, was of so much worth in the eyes of God, answerably to the interior sense of what faith in itself is, that in view of it he counted him righteous, allowed him to stand towards himself in this relation. The general sense of this fact now, Paul applies to the relation in which the christian stands to God. Faith is brought to pass in his case by the same psychological and ethical process as in the case of Abraham, though the object of the faith may be different. It is of the same significance as a deciding and determining power for the entire

religious life, and the force of it is still to place a sinful man in the same relation to God by which he becomes righteous. The christian *through it* alone can become, what God proposes to make of him by his grace. Here again we have an example of genuine practical exegesis, although we have to supply the links which it is the business of scientific inquiry to bring into view.

One more example finally we note, where Paul (1 Cor. ix : 9) applies the regulation of the Mosaic law Deut. xxv : 4, to the case of ministers in the christian churches, for whose support they are bound to provide in view of their having devoted all their activity to the spiritual service of their brethren. In this view he says with such reference : "Doth God take care for oxen ? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes ? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written." The passage however in its historical character did certainly refer to animals. The Mosaic law aimed to prefigure an ethical conception even in the treatment of the animal world. The counterpart of that righteousness which is due towards men, must be called into typical exercise in this conduct already towards mere dumb beasts. But the apostle applies it at once to the last term of the ethical conception, as this regards the treatment of men. He springs over the intervening general thought ; this namely, that from what is due even to animals laboring for us, we should learn what we are bound to do for men laboring for us, how we must recompense their service and not withhold from them their right. And this general thought is now at once applied to the particular relation of the congregation to their teachers. Here also we see what practical exegesis has to perform, how it must derive the general from the particular, and then apply this again to existing circumstances and wants ; and here also as regards the intermediate operations belonging to science, the same is to be said that has been said before.

We have only a word yet to say on the importance of practical exegesis, for those who undertake the office of the sacred ministry, especially at the present time. We have in the Evangelical Church no priestly office. We know only one Priest for mankind at large, and are persuaded that through him all believers have become a priestly race, that every christian is a priest in the calling assigned to him of God. In this respect accordingly those, who from having the gift of teaching or of government specially bestowed upon them have been called by the church to exercise a corresponding office in its service, have still no priority over the rest of the congregation. Neither can we say that in virtue of their office they alone are called to go before

all others with the light of a holy and exemplary life; for this also belongs to the common character of all who call themselves christians; as just in this consists indeed the signature and badge of their new priestly character. In this respect office gives no advantage; and there may be common members in the congregation whose piety forms its salt, and who in the attributes of a holy life excel those, that by their gifts and calling are placed ministerially at its head. It should be a pleasure to ministers, where they can discern such a work of the Holy Ghost in any of the members of their churches, thankfully and humbly to acknowledge the fact. Those who have made the farthest progress in sanctification, are not just by this called and qualified to take the government of the church into their hands. It would be a misapprehension of their gifts and calling, a mark of spiritual pride, if they should make any such pretension. It must be indeed the *endeavor* and *effort* of those who are at the head of the church to take the lead of all in life as well as word; for the two things of a truth go closely together. And from the beginning, one who seeks to prepare himself for the vocation of a minister should be occupied with this feeling, so as to bring all his knowledge to bear at once on his own life, and to fit himself by his life still for acquiring new knowledge. *Πρῶτος ἐνίσταται* *εὐσέπας*, as Gregory of Nazianzen says, He who is not filled with this feeling should have nothing to do with theology from the start, that he may not pursue this study to his own condemnation; of which we have alas but too many sad exemplifications in this time of sifting in the case of those, who through this study have become the most violent enemies of the gospel, like salt that has lost its savor, and from corrupt theologians have turned out to be at last only shallow and profane demagogues. But still we cannot allow of any calling as such, that those belonging to it have the advantage of all others in the power of being holy.

What is it then that should distinguish those who are usually styled ministers from the church in general, that should form their special *záρισμα* or gift? It is this, that by a scientifically developed sense they should form the medium of connection between the congregation and the Divine word contained in the sacred scriptures, that they should be thus the conscious bearers of the Divine word for the use of the congregation. Herein consists their true dignity, to be only organs of the word for the people, that it may be not themselves speaking in what they preach but the word speaking through them, that they lead the people to make all of the word and to give up their whole life

to its guidance. The light of the Holy Ghost as it is obtained by devotional diligence and prayer, they have in common with other believers; whence they may learn too even from enlightened lay persons, so far as regards the interior understanding of the Divine word from spiritual experience. In this respect also there is no privileged class; the light of the Holy Ghost is no monopoly. But what proceeds from scientific study alone, and is to be reached only by persevering exercise under the conduct of a scientific consciousness, this should those who stand at the head of the church possess in distinction from and above others. Only thus are they qualified to take such lead, which can never have place rightly except by means of the word. By means of practical exegesis, in the view of it now presented ministers should be interpreters of the Divine word for the life of the people, and should lead them to make a proper application of it to all living relations; something only then possible indeed, according to what we have seen, where the scientific understanding of the Scriptures with all its needful scientific conditions has gone before, so as to form always the sure ground for practical exposition. So should the sermon in particular breathe with practical exegesis, and in this way make itself felt on life. When this happens, preaching will be found what its end requires, the means whereby the Holy Ghost, who speaks in the word, speaks from it at the same time, by the organs he has formed for the purpose, to the life of the present time. All will become thus more full of thought and at the same time more individual.

And to glance now a moment at our own time. Here meets us the conflict between the old church orthodoxy and the culture of the age. There is now needed especially a right adjustment, between what is solid in the existing culture and the system of Christianity, which rejects nothing that belongs to the true human development of man's nature, to true humanity, but only seeks to transform all into a higher character. The problem is, after the pattern of the apostle Paul, to become all things to all men; not to sink down to the world, but to raise all from the world to heaven, to gain them for Christ. It must be shown to all, that there is one pearl which in its brilliancy far eclipses all other pearls, for which he who has found it is gladly ready to part with all besides, for the one highest good giving up all other forms of good—a sacrifice however which only brings them back again with new worth. Those whose minds are entangled in the conflict of old and new just mentioned, should by the pulpit be made to see and feel, that it is only in christianity still they can find all that their frequently unconscious longings seek, and

that their seeking itself proceeds more or less from the unconscious influence of christianity. This can be done, only through a right negotiation between the contents of the Divine word and the answer that is to be given to all the life questions of the age. Such a negotiation however, as is clear from what has been already said, can be brought to pass by means of practical exegesis alone. By this will the old become new and the new old. We think we have perceived, that in many quarters, where there was no lack of earnestly pious and enlightened ministers, these have still failed to exert a proper influence on the mass, just because they were deficient in this pliant mediatory skill, and could move forever only in one and the same circle of doctrinal or experimental notions.

The age needs a proper mediation between Christianity and the secular culture that has fallen away from its authority. What usually happens in such times of crisis, when a deeply felt religious want seeks vent in conflict with a worldly or infidel tendency, when the presentiment of something new, that *must* come, an inward longing towards it fills unsatisfied minds, namely that manifold forms of lawless self-will, manifold outbursts of enthusiasm, are found to prevail; ¹ this observation, we say, has begun to verify itself also in our age, and may be expected to do so more and more, until the new day which all desire shall be ushered in. However such appearances may fill us with grief, they still carry this comfort, that the present is no time of death stillness, that the mighty throes attending the birth of a new life can be seen and felt on all sides. In such a time it is especially needful again on this side also, that the application of the Divine word, which alone can furnish the true mean between the antagonisms that lead to perverseness and distortion, which alone can produce healthy clearness of mind, should discover to the age the crimson clew that may lead it through this labyrinth to the true and right issue, safe from the undue influence of a onesided subjectivity, which is ever prone to extravagance and excess. And for this practical exegesis will alone serve.

We have already said, that this art can be brought properly to prosper, only when we cease to look upon the collection of the sacred writings, with onesided doctrinal view, as a stiff uniform codex of divine revelation, when another conception of inspira-

¹ We are reminded of the word uttered by the Parisian chancellor Gerson, from the heart of such a time: *Fefellit multos nimia sensimentorum conquisitio*:

tion, more living and growing more directly out of the bosom of religious feeling itself, has taken the place completely of the old mechanical theory. For this very reason the later theology, of which the art is to be a distinguishing ornament, shows itself specially adapted to promote practical exegesis in the right form; as this is suited also to show, that by the overthrow of that old contracted view nothing is lost in the use to be derived from the Scriptures, but rather a great deal gained. In a still higher and richer sense than before, will the Bible by this means, remain, in the face of all sorts of worldly culture and outliving the whole, the Book of Life. Men will no longer seek to find in it the solution of questions that pertain only to the interest of science in its different spheres, or that go quite beyond the range of human knowledge,¹ but will use it as the oracle for all that is necessary for man's *salvation*, for all the relations of life as they should be ordered in reference to its eternal scope. And for such right use of the Bible always practical exegesis must still show the way.

Translated by J. W. N.

MODERN CIVILIZATION.

Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their effects on the Civilization of Europe. Written in Spanish by the Rev. J. BALMES. Translated from the French. Baltimore: Published by John Murphy & Co. Pittsburg: George Quigley. 1851. 8vo. pp. 514.

A VERY interesting and able work; written by a devoted Roman Catholic; but none the less worthy for this reason of being diligently read and considered by all intelligent and earnest minded Protestants. It is the boast of Protestantism, we all know, to seek the light, to shrink from no inquiry, to encourage the most unbounded intellectual and religious freedom, to be ready to listen at least even to an enemy's voice speaking in the name of reason, and not to refuse instruction from whatever quarter the smallest measure of it can be drawn. The only regret would seem to be with a certain class of its champions

¹ ἡ δὲ ἐπιστήμη ἀναζητῶν, curiously praying into the secrets of the invisible world, Col. ii: 18.

often, that the opposite interest, that of the Roman Church, is not willing to meet it on the same fair, liberal and honorable terms; that when it says, "Come let us *reason* together," that proud party should only scorn the proposal, and seek on principle and system rather to cover itself up in blind fog, and to resist all learned investigation as something that is felt instinctively to be full of danger to all its towering pretensions. The complaint is that Roman Catholics love darkness rather than light, and are not willing to stand forward before the world, and give account of the faith that is in them at the bar of history and logic. In these circumstances, the book before us certainly deserves a welcome reception at the hands even of those whom it undertakes to assail and attack. For it is no vulgar onset, made up merely of declamatory noise and slang. It abounds, beyond all contradiction, in comprehensive learning and profound observation. It is full moreover of vivacity, the vigor of a fresh spiritual life, such as it is refreshing to commune with, whether we can lend ourselves fully to its cause or not. The work has evidently suffered some by translation, but it retains still no small amount of its original glow, rising at times into actual eloquence of no ordinary kind. Here then is just what we should all be glad to see, an able and dignified attempt on the side of Romanism to show itself better than Protestantism, on the very field which this last has been most ready of late to claim as altogether its own, the relative bearing of the two systems namely on the progress of modern society. Now instead of battling with the wind, our valorous Samsons have the opportunity of grappling, shoulder to shoulder, with a real flesh and blood foe, in the full panoply of Rome, whom all must allow to be in every respect worthy of their best prowess and zeal. Shall we not be glad of this for *their* sakes, as well as for the sake of that great cause of truth which is here in controversy and debate? Here is a fair field for new laurels, more green than any that have yet crowned their brows. Will they suffer it to go without improvement and use? One solid refutation of such a work as this of Balme would be a more meritorious achievement for Protestantism, than fifty or five hundred replies to Archbishop Hughes in the reigning pulpit and rostrum style. What we need is not declamation and bold popular rant, but true scientific discussion; such as Rome is commonly charged with eschewing and abhorring, but has here at least happily so far forgotten herself as of her own accord to offer and court, on an arena which is open to the free gaze of the whole world. Let the book be read, and not ignored or treated as a nursery tale. Let its facts and rea-

ings be examined and understood, and not set aside with the wholesale flippancy of common schoolboy learning. Let its argument be honorably and honestly met and shorn of its strength, not turned into mountebank caricature merely, misrepresented and abused. Then in truth shall we have a victory, worthy of something more than bonfires and crackers. Nothing will be lost, but much gained, for the Protestant interest, by a trial of its merits thus ending in its own more full and conspicuous vindication. It is not by having nothing to withstand and surmount, but by facing rather and overcoming the most powerful opposition, that a good cause is shown to be worthy of confidence and trust. It is when the floods come and the winds blow, that the house on the rock is proved to be better than that whose foundation is only in the sand.¹

The work before us, we say, deserves the attention of intelligent Protestants, viewed merely in its polemical relations towards the system with which they are identified in opposition to the Church of Rome; for it is a respectable, dignified and truly learned challenge in this view, which furnishes fair and fit *occasion* at least, (not less perhaps than even the celebrated "Symbolik" of the German Möhler.) for revising and resettling if possible still more firmly than before the argument for the Reformation. But we should not do justice either to the book or to our-

¹ Some, we know, affect to deride the idea of any such really trying force in any shape, on the side of the Roman Church. They will have it, that all its artillery is made up of fools' bells and children's rattles. To such we commend the following caution, which we are glad to find lately in the *New York Observer*:—"It is quite fashionable to sneer at Catholics as, on the whole, rather contemptible antagonists. They may have learning, it is thought, but it is antiquated lumber. They may have eloquence, but it tends to declamation. They may have art, but the cunning is too transparent, to be tried before an American community. Those who reason thus, do not know the resources which Rome possesses, and can create in men. They ought not to judge of all Romanist archbishops, by John of New York. There are men here, or certainly there are men in training to come among us, who will try to do the same work which Cardinal Wiseman has done in England. The power of eloquence, and learning, and sanctity, has not yet been exhausted in the service of that terrible organization, that wondrous device of the wicked one; and Protestants are called on to see to it, that there shall be men as learned, as accomplished, and more truly Christian, in training, to cope with the emissaries from Rome. Let us take warning in time. It is not by declamation, nor by contempt, nor even by sinewy argument for the common mind, that this foe is to be effectually overcome; but learning, and eloquence, and taste, and piety combined, must be formed and sustained by Protestant institutions of the highest and most thorough character—or we shall suffer for our neglect."

selves, if we shrunk from acknowledging that its claims to the interest of Protestants, in our eyes, go much beyond such merely incidental and comparatively indirect use. To a large extent, we look upon it as a noble and masterly apology for the cause of Christianity itself, over against the radical and infidel tendencies of the age, which under the plausible cover of hostility to Rome and zeal for freedom, are directed in truth against the whole mystery of Christ and his Church, and would if it were possible sweep it entirely from the face of the earth. There is a certain style of Protestantism, we know, though certainly a very bad style of it, which is ready at once to place itself in the wrong here, by confounding such an apology for the Christian Church with an apology for Romanism as it now stands, and so planting itself in opposition to it on the same ground substantially with the antichristian interest against which directly the defence is directed; as though it were better in this case to make common cause for the time with infidelity itself, than to be found in any sort of juxtaposition with Rome. With this way of thinking we of course have no sympathy; neither are we willing for one moment to allow, that the main body of the cause so eloquently set forth in the argument of the learned and pious Balmes belongs to Romanism only, and not to Protestantism; for that would be tantamount in our mind to a surrendry of this last interest altogether, as something in no sort comprehended in the past life of the Church and the glorious fountain from which it springs. The more trophies and crowns of honor the Church of former ages can be shown to have won in the service of her adorable Head, the more tokens her history can be brought to furnish of his powerful presence in her midst, the more will we be pleased and rejoice, Protestant though we be; and we shall not suffer our satisfaction to be taken from us certainly, just because Romanism, as in the present case, may be active in proclaiming the distinction, and would fain turn it exclusively to its own credit. Looking at the matter in this way, we know no good reason why the book before us should not be welcome to Protestants, as a general apology for Christianity, full as much as to Romanists.

We should be glad indeed to have it widely studied, for the very reason that it seems to us admirably adapted to expose and counteract those false views of the past history of the Church, to which we have already referred as too often usurping the Protestant name, and causing it to appear in bad connection with open unbelief. It belongs to the character of this Pseudo-protestantism, to make the chasm as wide and deep as possible, be-

tween the time since the Reformation and the time that went before. It takes a pleasure in finding all wrong and false in the one direction, in order to have the more reason for glorifying all as right and true in the other. The reign of Christ, in its eyes, took a new start with Luther, after having been through ten long centuries overwhelmed almost entirely by the reign of Satan. There were no doubt all along a few witnesses for the truth here and there in places out of the way ; but the great body of the so called christian world, the nominal succession of the universal christian name, had become hopelessly corrupt, wedded and sold to the power of all sorts of error ; so that the only wonder is, that it should have been able to hold together at all, to keep up its own organization, through so vast a tract of time. But this simply shows, how an infernal policy had got possession of the visible church for its own ends. The whole was indeed the Devil's master-piece, a wondrous device of the Wicked One, to enslave the nations and lead them captive at his will. It was indeed sufficiently irrational and absurd, as well as monstrously profane, and at the same time so boldly and impudently arrogant in its pretensions, putting its foot on the neck of kings, that we may well be astonished at the long and wide success of its usurpations ; but the time was dark and the mind of the world unripe ; and all pains were taken by the usurping power to perpetuate the darkness, nay to make it always more black and deep, as a favorable covering for its nefarious purposes and plans. There was a systematic effort made to extinguish the light of the Bible, and to bind the human mind in chains of ignorance and superstition. All free inquiry was discouraged, and the rights of private judgment trampled under foot. The doctrine and discipline of the Church, in the hands of a licentious ambitious priesthood, became both together a pliant contrivance merely, for the advancement of high handed spiritual tyranny in one direction and the most abject blind obedience and bondage in another. Thus the presence of the Church lay like a fatal incubus, throughout Europe, on all upward tendencies in the moral and social system, not for one century only, but for a whole dreary millenium of years. The nations were struck as with deadly paralysis, and had no power over their own limbs. All political institutions were hindered in their natural growth. Letters languished. Morals and manners ran perfectly wild. It was one age of darkness always only followed by another. To imagine any real progress in such circumstances is out of the question ; the most that can be allowed is, that the ulcer of the times might have been gradually ripening towards such bad extremity,

as was needed to call out the latent powers of society finally in the way of protest and redress. It would be a relief, only to be sure that history stood still. But it is not of the nature of the world's life to remain thus stationary for a thousand years. Not to move forwards, is as a general law to move in the contrary direction; and it would seem accordingly that in the case before us, the shadow actually went back on the dial plate of civilization, God only knows how many degrees, between the sixth century and the sixteenth. In the ever memorable and graphically characteristic language of *Kierkegaard*, the coryphaeus of this theory of history: "When the Reformation occurred, the *retrograde* movement of the world towards ignorance and barbarism and idolatry, had *almost* been completed. Had it not occurred, a radiance might continue to gild the high places of earth after the gospel sun had set—a twilight might be protracted for a few ages in which a few might grope their way to heaven; but each age would have come wrapped in a deeper and yet deeper gloom, until impenetrable darkness had fallen on the world!"

What a dismal picture of God's providence and Christ's faithfulness to his own word, in the history of Christianity for a thousand years! And there are men, calling themselves evangelical and friends of the Saviour's cause beyond others, who can gloat over this view of the past, and feed their fancy sweetly on its hideous features, out of spite to Rome, in the imagination that they are doing God service, as well as pleasing their own hearts, by their miserable infidelity. To all such, who may have a zeal for Protestantism in their own way, but not according to either faith or knowledge, as well as to all others also of better disposition, who may find their minds bewildered and oppressed with the authority of this false theory of church history, without being reconciled to it in their hearts, we earnestly commend the book here under review, as one eminently suited to assist them at least, in rising towards a higher, purer and more animating vision of the glorious city and commonwealth of God. The very object of the work is one, that should find a response in every believer's soul. In full contrast with the Pseudo-protestant spirit just noticed, it moves in the element not of infidelity but of faith, and aims not to undermine, but to establish the Divine character of Christianity, by showing that the seals of its truth which appear upon it in the beginning, the evidences in its favor that stand forth to view from its history during the first four centuries, are followed by corresponding seals and evidences under the same outward form in the centuries of darkness that follow. Is not this a noble purpose? And if it can be to any ex-

tent made good, shall it not be considered a welcome service which is thus rendered to the cause of religion and piety? If it be honorable to vindicate the ways of God to man in common history, or in the constitution of mere nature, how much more should it be so regarded to vindicate his truth and fidelity, as they are concerned in the history of his Church for ten centuries of years. Any argument that addresses itself to such an object in a serious and manly way, deserves at once our gratitude and respect.

We have good right in this case to say still farther, that the only proper posture to begin with in any such inquiry, is that of trust and hope in favor of the end it aims to reach. It has often been remarked truly, that the first condition for doing justice in any case to the evidence in favor of religious truth, is a certain measure of sympathy with the truth itself and a wish to find it true; whereas an opposite leaning of the heart, or even a state of cold philosophical indifference, can hardly fail to act as a heavy downward weight in the wrong scale. Apply this to the general question here in hand. Did the presence of God in the Church, as it may be clearly read in the first four centuries of its history, become a total failure in the ten centuries that followed, making room only for the presence of the Devil; or may it still be read, from the fifth century down to the fifteenth, by tokens no less wonderful and glorious than before? To this question the really *christian* answer, it is plain, can be but one; and that is such as springs at once to the mouth of all childlike unsophisticated faith. The overwhelming presumption, not to be got rid of without an effort, where the divine origin of our holy religion has at all made itself felt, is that God did not forsake the work of his own hands after the fourth century, but continued to reign over it through the Middle Ages as directly as before; so much the honor and credit of the christian cause is felt imperiously to require; and so far as the heart is at all properly predisposed towards this cause, and in sympathy with it, it cannot fail both to expect and to desire that such natural presumption in its favor shall turn out to be in full agreement with the actual voice of facts. The man who comes to the study of the first three centuries of ecclesiastical history with the skeptical spirit of a Gibbon or Voltaire, as compared for instance with the childlike veneration of a Neander, is by his very position disqualified for all sound historical judgment in the matter with which he is called to deal; his mind is vitiated by the prejudice of infidelity from the very start; and it is only natural accordingly, that he should find all to be as destitute of divinity as it is the wish of

his heart it should be, a jumble of absurdities, a tissue of delusions, in which is to be read no trace whatever of God's supernatural presence, but the melancholy record only of corruption, passion and folly, on the part of man. And why should the same observation be of any less force, when extended to the ecclesiastical history of a later time? Shall that, be taken as a recommendation for the student of such history here, which in the other case is allowed on all hands to amount to a full disability for his task; that he comes to it, namely, with the unbelieving sneering humor of an absolutely infidel mind, wishing to find all as bad as possible, and fully possessed beforehand with the theory, that it is a reign of wickedness and folly only that fills the history of the Church through this long period, the very masterpiece indeed and most perfect work of the Devil, and in no sense whatever a reign of righteousness and truth presided over by the Holy Ghost? To state such a question simply, is at the same time to expose its absurdity. No; in this whole controversy, we are bound to see and allow that the presumption of truth, for all true christian feeling, is from the outset against Pseudo-protestantism and in favor of the opposite side. This wholesale denunciation of the Church of the Middle Ages, accompanied with ribaldry and scorn, whatever ulterior object men may mean to serve by it, is in its own nature of infidel relationship and complexion; and from the very outset therefore we are bound to regard it with suspicion, to go against it with our prayers and wishes, and to withhold from it all assent that is not as it were wrenched from us by proofs that cut off all room for question or debate. Such a work as this of Balme's on the contrary, so far as it aims simply to establish the honor and credit of the cause thus maligned and to vindicate the faithfulness of God to his own word for a thousand years, challenges our best sympathies in its favor from the start. We feel, so far as the pulse of a sound christian life beats in our hearts, that it ought to come off victorious; we wish it success; we make common cause with it in our desires and hopes. A friendly spirit seems to surround us in its pages. We are refreshed and invigorated by the very air that breathes upon us from the whole region and field of its argument; for it is the element of faith and reverence and love, that comes to the soul like the sense of its proper native home; and to move in it is of itself at once a source of spiritual joy and strength.

It will be observed, that the work before us aims in fact at two general purposes: first, to vindicate the honor and credit of the Church before the time of the Reformation, as the true mother

of our modern civilization and culture ; secondly, to show that Protestantism, instead of helping, has only hindered and retarded the onward movement of this cause. These two objects in the mind of the author indeed seem to be almost one and the same. But it needs no great depth of reflection certainly to see, that they can easily bear separation. We may allow the first, and yet oppose the second. Pseudo-protestantism indeed, as we have just seen, falls in here with the other view ; making the opposition between the time before the Reformation and the time since to be of such a nature, that any merit allowed to the first must be taken as an equivalent drawback on the worth of the second. But this is in reality to give up the defence of Protestantism altogether, and to sell the whole cause into the hand of its enemies. We of course agree to no such treason. On the contrary we earnestly protest against it, as the sorest and deepest wrong that could well be inflicted on the Protestant cause. We deny that the honors and glories of the Church before the Reformation, whether in the first or middle centuries, belong exclusively in the way of historical heritage to the present Roman communion. Our faith in Protestantism is conditioned by the assumption, that the succession of the old church life still flows truly and vigorously in its veins. Why then should we wish to detract from the merit of this life at any point, and not be pleased rather with all that redounds to its praise ? When the question is asked : What part has it had in the great work of modern civilization ? we are quite willing, nay anxious, to find the answer as widely favorable as possible ; and we give ourselves no trouble, in this case, about the bearing this may have on the comparative merits of Romanism and Protestantism. That brings into view another question altogether, which we would be very sorry to consider so involved in the first as to be brought to a conclusion by it one way or the other.

Modern European Civilization presents to our view the grandest and most imposing spectacle in the universal history of the world. With all the richness and variety of its contents, with all the field it covers in space and the long tract through which it reaches in time, it is still a single fact, capable of being viewed as a whole and allowing comparison in this way with other facts of the like sort, other systems of civilization that have passed away before it or that still prevail in other parts of the earth. So we find it commended to our attention in the celebrated Historical Lectures of M. Guizot. The more the subject is studied, in the way of comparison and contrast especially with the ancient civilization, and with due regard to all the conditions under

which the modern culture has been brought to pass, the more full of interest will it appear and worthy of admiration. The modern civilization of Europe is in some respects a comparatively recent fact ; it begins to appear in its proper form only a few centuries back, and is still but entering we may say on the full solution of its own social and moral problems. But as such a new creation, it is not to be regarded of course as bursting upon the world by accident or sudden surprise. There was a long preparation for it in previous ages ; and this preparation enters properly into the constitution of the fact itself, just as really as the growth of the stem or stalk is one with the life of the bursting flower that forms its end. The greatness of the fact here is to be estimated by the wide and vast scale of material, time and work, through which it was brought to pass. A full thousand years were required, to bring it up to the form it carried in the age of the Reformation. To understand it properly, to do justice to the historical greatness of the fact, we must consider it as a process or movement reaching through all this time ; we must have clearly before us the difference between the beginning and the end ; we must be familiar in our thoughts with the elements of darkness, disorder and contradiction, in the midst of which the work of regeneration was to be carried forward from age to age.

The old Roman civilization, it will be borne in mind, had run its course and was ready to perish of its own accord ; when the full tide of barbarism was poured upon it from the North, and scarce a wreck was left to tell of its ancient glory. It is hard for us now to form a conception of the political ruin that followed. The foundations of society were literally broken up, and moral chaos reigned on every side. The elements of barbarism were let loose in every direction, to roll and toss in perpetual confusion without control. There was nothing stable or firm. "States were created, suppressed, united, and divided ; no governments, no frontiers, no nations ; a general jumble of situations, principles, events, races, languages : such was barbarian Europe." Thus speaks M. Guizot ; who then goes on also to tell us, that this tumultuating state of society lasted through hundreds of years. "It must not be supposed that the invasions of the barbarian hordes stopped all at once, in the fifth century. Do not believe that because the Roman empire was fallen, and kingdoms of barbarians founded upon its ruins, that the movement of nations was over. There are plenty of facts to prove that this was not the case, and that this movement lasted a long time after the destruction of the empire." To the invasions

from the north was added in time the Saracen pressure on the south. "Such was the situation of Europe from the fifth to the ninth century. Pressed on the south by the Mohammedans, and on the north by the Germans and Slavonians, it could not be otherwise than that the reaction of this double invasion should keep the interior of Europe in a continual ferment. Populations were incessantly displaced, crowded one upon another; there was no regularity, nothing permanent or fixed."¹ Various attempts were made to reorganize society; but it was not till after the commencement of the tenth century, according to Guizot, that the reign of barbarism could be said to have received any effectual and lasting check. And then of course the material out of which the new order was to rise, lay still in rude and wild disorder on all sides. It was the work of centuries still to bring them into shape and fit them to their proper place. There were indeed dark ages, wild ages, abounding in ignorance, wickedness, lawlessness and blood. But the worse we conceive of them in this view, the more reason only will we have to admire the mighty power of the process which was still at work in the bosom of them, to bend such unruly forces to its own use in the elaboration of the modern European culture, and the deeper must be at the same time our sense of the greatness and significance of this vast social result. For out of chaos here, through centuries of strife and confusion, has sprung in truth a new world of order and light and law, such as earth never saw before; a civilization which with all its present defects, and the dangers of failure to which it is still exposed, must be allowed immeasurably to surpass in what it has already produced, and in its capabilities of future production, every other human civilization that has yet appeared.

In explaining this great historical fact, it is known generally that M. Guizot allows a large place to the agency of the Church, as one of the factors concerned throughout in bringing it to pass. In this respect he shows himself a more respectable Protestant, and with all his rationalistic sympathies is found to be a more safe guide in the sphere of religion, than many of far less learning and much higher pretension to piety, with whom it is a point of orthodoxy to reduce this agency to zero, or even a good many degrees lower still, for the purpose of disparaging the Christianity of the Middle Ages. "The Church," he tells us, "has ex-

¹ General History of Civilization in Europe. American ed. 1838. p. 73-75.

exercised a vast and important influence upon the moral and intellectual order of Europe; upon the notions, sentiments, and manners of society. This fact is evident; the intellectual and moral progress of Europe has been essentially theological. Look at its history from the fifth to the sixteenth century, and you will find throughout, that theology has possessed and directed the human mind; every idea is impressed with theology; every question that has been started, whether philosophical, political, or historical, has been considered in a religious point of view. So powerful indeed has been the authority of the church in matters of intellect, that even the mathematical and physical sciences have been obliged to submit to its doctrines. The spirit of theology has been as it were the blood which has circulated in the veins of the European world, down to the time of Bacon and Descartes."—"The influence of the Church, moreover, has given to the development of the human mind, in our modern world, an extent and variety which it never possessed elsewhere. In the East, intelligence was altogether religious: among the Greeks it was almost exclusively human. There human culture, humanity, properly so called, its nature and destiny, actually disappeared: here it was man alone, his passions, his feelings, his present interests, which occupied the field. In our world the spirit of religion mixes itself with all, but excludes nothing.—Thus the two great sources of human development, humanity and religion, have been open at the same time, and flowed in plenteous streams. Notwithstanding all the evil, all the abuses, which may have crept into the Church, notwithstanding all the acts of tyranny of which she has been guilty, we must still acknowledge her influence upon the progress and culture of the human intellect to have been beneficial; that she has assisted in its development rather than its compression, in its extension rather than its confinement."¹ Guizot takes pains moreover to distinguish in this case between simple Christianity and the Church. "At the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth, (Lect. II. p. 50.) Christianity was no longer a simple belief, it was an institution—it had formed itself into a corporate body. It had its government, a body of priests; a settled ecclesiastical polity for the regulation of their different functions; revenues; independent means of influence." As a mere doctrine or theory the new religion would not have been able to sustain itself at all in the dissolution of the old Roman

¹ Gen. Hist. of Civ., p. 151, 153.

world, much less to control in any way the action of the blind forces that now gained the ascendancy. "At this time there existed none of those means, by which in the present day moral influences become established or rejected without the aid of institutions; none of those means by which an abstract truth now makes way, gains an authority over mankind, governs their actions, and directs their movements. Nothing of this kind existed in the fourth century; nothing which could give to simple ideas, to personal opinions, so much weight and power. Hence I think it may be assumed, that only a society firmly established under a powerful government and rules of discipline could hope to bear up amid such disasters, could hope to weather so violent a storm. I think then, humanly speaking, that it is not too much to aver, that in the fourth and fifth centuries it was the christian church that saved christianity; that it was the christian church, with its institutions, its magistrates, its authority,—the christian church which struggled so vigorously to prevent the interior dissolution of the empire, which struggled against the barbarian and which in fact overcame the barbarian: it was this *church*, I say, that became the great connecting link—the principle of civilization, between the Roman and the barbarian world."

At the same time M. Guizot does not hesitate to ascribe a certain amount of evil also, to the general agency here brought into view. "By softening the rugged manners and sentiments of the people; by raising her voice against a great number of practical barbarisms, and doing what she could to expel them, there is no doubt but the Church largely contributed to the amelioration of the social condition; but with regard to *politics* properly so called, with regard to all that concerns the relations between the governing and the governed, between power and liberty," her influence in his opinion (p. 153.) has been baneful. Altogether too the agency in question is treated in these famous Lectures only as one among several other great factors, that might seem to have wrought together, with a sort of accidental conjunction and co-ordination, under the conduct of Divine Providence, for the accomplishment of the ultimate result. Much account is made in this way particularly of certain traits and tendencies supposed to have been imbedded in the original nature of the Teutonic barbarians, such as the feeling of personal independence and the idea of military patronage, that grew up subsequently into the feudal system. The theory is, that modern civilization, in its infancy and throughout, is a sort of compound of various independent forces and elements, that

have conspired with more or less volcanic confusion and violence to bring it to pass; among which it is felt necessary in philosophical candor to assign a conspicuous place to the organization of the Medieval Church, whose activity is found to run parallel at least with other forms of power from the commencement of the whole movement to its close.

In the work of Balmes now before us regard is had all along to this theory of M. Guizot, as one which with all its pretended fairness does gross wrong to the actual truth of history, as well as to the honor of the christian religion. The work of the Spaniard however is of a far wider range than that of the Frenchman, and throws it also completely into the shade by its superior learning and more brilliant style of thought. He gives the whole glory of our modern civilization to the Church. There were other powers of course, merely natural and secular elements, that entered largely into the process; but these are not to be regarded as parallel or co-ordinate with the Church; they were but as matter and stuff rather in her hands, which took shape and place at last in the general structure only through the plastic pressure by which they were thus powerfully ruled; to her in a sense exclusively belonged under God the animating supernatural spirit and wondrous architectural skill, by which the whole work age after age was slowly carried towards the skies.

"Our hearts swell with generous indignation," this author writes, "when we hear the religion of Jesus Christ reproached with a tendency towards oppression. It is true, that if you confound the spirit of real liberty with that of demagogues, you will not find it in Catholicity; but if you avoid a monstrous misnomer, if you give to the word liberty its reasonable, just, useful and beneficial signification, then the Catholic religion may fearlessly claim the gratitude of the human race, *for she has civilized the nations who embraced her, and civilization is true liberty.*"—"With respect to civilization, a distinction is sometimes made between the influence of Christianity and that of Catholicity; its merits are lavished on the former, and stinted to the latter, by those who forget that, with respect to European civilization, Catholicity can always claim the principal share, and for many centuries an exclusive one; since during a very long period she worked alone at the great work. People have not been willing to see, that when Protestantism appeared in Europe, the work was bordering on completion; with an injustice and an ingratitude which I cannot describe, they have reproached Catholicity with the spirit of barbarism, ignorance and oppression, while they were making an ostentatious display of

the rich civilization, knowledge and liberty, for which they were principally indebted to her." A proper comparison between the course of life in the East, where this agency was in large measure wanting, and the progress seen in the West, where it was in full force, should of itself be enough to correct this false judgment. "In the West, the revolutions were multiplied and fearful; the chaos was at its height; and nevertheless, out of chaos came light and life. Neither the barbarism of the nations who inundated those countries, and established themselves there, nor the previous assaults of Islamism, even in the days of its greatest power and enthusiasm, could succeed in destroying the germs of a rich and fertile civilization. In the East, on the contrary, all tended to old age and decay; nothing revived; and under the blows of the power which was ineffectual against us, all was shaken to pieces. The spiritual power of Rome and its influence on temporal affairs, have certainly borne fruits very different from those produced, under the same circumstances, by its violent opponents."—P. 80, 81.

"Although the Church attached the greatest importance to the propagation of truth, although she was convinced that to destroy the shapeless mass of immorality and degradation that met her sight, her first care should be to expose error to the dissolving fire of true doctrines, she did not confine herself to this; but, descending to real life, and following a system full of wisdom and prudence, she acted in such a manner as to enable humanity to taste the precious fruit which the doctrines of Jesus Christ produce even in temporal things. The Church was not only a great and fruitful school; she was also a regenerative association; she did not diffuse her general doctrines by throwing them abroad at hazard, merely hoping that they would fructify with time; she developed them in all their relations, applied them to all subjects, inoculated laws and manners with them, and realized them in institutions which afforded silent but eloquent instructions to future generations. Nowhere was the dignity of man acknowledged, slavery reigned everywhere; degraded woman was dishonored by the corruption of manners, and debased by the tyranny of man. The feelings of humanity were trodden under foot, infants were abandoned, the sick and aged were neglected, barbarity and cruelty were carried to the highest pitch of atrocity in the prevailing laws of war; in fine, on the summit of the social edifice was seen an odious tyranny, sustained by military force, and looking down with an eye of contempt on the unfortunate nations that lay in fetters at its feet. —In such a state of things it certainly was no slight task, to re-

move error, to reform and improve manners, abolish slavery, correct the vices of legislation, impose a check on power and make it harmonize with the public interest, give new life to individuals, and reorganize family and society ; and yet nothing less than this was done by the Church."—P. 90, 91.

This vast work of social regeneration required for its basis the *destruction of slavery*. It is not easy for us now to conceive of the extent to which this evil prevailed in the ancient world, or of the difficulties that stood in the way of its perfect extirpation. Guizot allows large credit to the Church for the revolution which has been wrought in regard to it, but refuses to give her full praise ; because, as he says, "slavery existed for a long time in the bosom of christian society without exciting astonishment or much opposition." But this only shows that the revolution was conservative and agreeable to the genius of the Gospel, not radical and after the fashion of Red Republicanism. "Slavery was deeply rooted in laws, manners, ideas, and interests, individual and social ; a fatal system, no doubt, but the eradication of which all at once it would have been rash to attempt, as its roots had penetrated deeply and spread widely in the bowels of the land." The number of slaves was immense. They could not be set free without the will of society, and their freedom also conferred upon them as a general sudden gift must have proved a curse to themselves as well as to others. To accomplish a real and lasting removal of the evil, it was necessary that the sources of it should be corrected, and that the general order of life out of which it grew should be brought to assume a new *spirit* and a different form. This was a work which in the nature of the case required the strong action of a profound and constant force, bearing through a series of centuries towards the same end. We have no right then, according to our author, to enter an exception to the credit of the Church in the case of this great work, on the ground that it was not carried through at once in a violent and sudden way. "That slavery endured for a long time in presence of the Church is true ; but it was always declining, and it only lasted as long as was necessary to realize the benefit without violence—without a shock—without compromising its universality and its continuation. Moreover we ought to subtract from the time of its continuance many ages, during which the Church was often proscribed, always regarded with aversion, and totally unable to exert a direct influence on the social organization. We ought also, to a great extent, to make exception of later times, as the Church had only begun to exert a direct and public influence, when the irruption of the northern

barbarians took place, which, together with the corruption that infected the empire and spread in a frightful manner, produced such a perturbation, such a confused mass of languages, customs, manners and laws, that it was almost impossible to make the regulating power produce salutary fruits. If in later times it has been difficult to destroy feudalism; if there remain to this day, after ages of struggles, the remnants of that constitution; if the slave trade, although limited to certain countries and circumstances, still merits the universal reprobation which is raised throughout the world against its infamy; how can we venture to express our astonishment, how can we venture to make it a reproach against the Church, that slavery continued some ages after she had proclaimed men's fraternity with each other, and their equality before God."—*P*, 34.

This leads to a somewhat extended view of the action of the Church towards slavery, in four separate chapters of the book devoted expressly to the purpose. In connection with these we have presented to us at the same time, in the way of appendix at the close of the volume, a tolerably full apparatus of the original authorities, the canons of different councils and other documents, on which the statements of the text are made to rest. The whole forms a very interesting and truly instructive disquisition on the subject of slavery, and its relations to the christian church, which well deserves the attention of the mere historical scholar as well as the friend of true religion. We find evidence enough of the continuance of this terrible social abuse in Europe far down towards modern times; references to its presence meet us on all sides; it might seem in one view even to have found a sanctuary in the bosom of the church itself. For we find here also the ownership of slaves, in the form directly of church property and in the service of the ministers of religion. It was necessary thus from time to time to restrain abuses that grew out of the evil among ecclesiastics and religious houses themselves; and for one bent on making out a dark picture of the Middle Ages, for the purpose of laying it all to the account of the church as it then stood, it would be easy enough to derive from this quarter alone the most ample material for denunciation and reproach. It was in truth a dark time, a period of wild disorder and misrule in the history of the European world. Strange illustrations of the rude state of manners meet us even in comparatively late times. What shall we say of the fact, that even so late as the twelfth century the Irish were accustomed to buy English slaves of merchants, robbers and pirates, and that it was quite common even for parents in England to sell their own

children into such miserable servitude ! But what now was the part taken by the Church, as a public historical institution, in regard to this monstrous system ? To this question, so soon as we refer to her own authoritative acts and declarations, there is but one answer and that immediately at hand. From first to last, her influence has been steadily directed against slavery. Under no circumstances has she allowed herself to be bribed into its service, so as to lend her countenance and sanction to it as something good in the social order of the world. She had a philosophy of her own here, far more sublime than that taught either by Plato or Aristotle, which she never relinquished for a moment, in the face of any amount of interest, power or fashion, arrayed on the opposite side. Her whole theory of man's personality, and of his relations to God, went in full opposition to the relation in question, and so far as it gained ground could not fail to sap and undermine always more and more the whole system of thought on which it depended. That this opposition was at the same time patient, that it did not expend itself at once in a whirlwind of fanaticism, that it protracted itself with a wise accommodation to circumstances from one age to another, in the midst of all sorts of difficulty and discouragement, only serves the more impressively to commend it to our admiration and respect, only goes the more fully to characterise the agency as something greater than mere humanity and in affinity with God.

Not only was the general doctrine of the church a quiet protest continually against slavery, there was a continual exercise besides of ecclesiastical legislation, all looking towards it as an evil and aiming to limit and restrain its abuses. It is remarkable that from first to last this agency never swerved from the one direction ; its scope was always the same. That manifold corruptions and abuses prevailed among the ministers of religion themselves, that the disorders of the time extended in the persons of many ecclesiastics to the very bosom of the sanctuary itself, is not to be questioned for a moment ; the evidence of it is found at large in the ecclesiastical monuments of every age ; but this only makes it the more wonderful, that the spirit of the system as a whole should notwithstanding have remained true always to the cause of humanity and mercy. The decrees of councils, the voice of the church in her corporate capacity, her universal policy and legislation, were ever on the side of righteousness and freedom and in opposition to tyrannical wrong. She regarded herself from the beginning as the refuge of the distressed, the advocate and helper of the needy ; and so the cause

of the slave also was viewed as her natural and proper charge. She was their patroness and guardian, and it was their privilege to lay claim to her protection in this character. Her relation to them is strikingly shown by the fact, that it was common for slaves who had offended their masters to fly to the christian temples as an asylum from their wrath; in which case her mediation was ever ready to be powerfully exercised in their favor. We find various decrees of councils bearing upon this object. So it was common to perform manumissions in the churches, for the purpose of making them more solemn, and to place those who were thus set free more immediately and fully under the care of the same powerful and tender mother. The protection of freed slaves was looked upon as her special trust. Hence the custom was introduced of recommending slaves to her care, by will or otherwise, for the more effectual accomplishment of their emancipation either at once or at some future time. In this way she came to have a large property in slaves herself, and all pains were taken indeed to increase this title; but it was a tenure for their advantage rather than her own, and looked towards freedom as its ultimate purpose and aim. In the end a special regulation was introduced, forbidding them to be passed into the hands of other masters; they are regarded as consecrated to God, and if their state was to be changed at all it must be for freedom only; and not for any other bondage. The zeal of the Church again for the redemption of captives, must have contributed powerfully to the abolition of slavery. This we know was of the most extraordinary character, stopping at no sacrifices for the accomplishment of its object. "The influence of it was so much the more salutary, as it was developed precisely at the time when it was most needed, that is, in those ages when the dissolution of the Roman empire, the irruption of the barbarians, the fluctuations of so many peoples, and the ferocity of the invading nations, rendered wars so frequent, revolutions so constant, and the empire of force so habitual and prevailing. Without the beneficent and liberating intervention of christianity, the immense number of slaves bequeathed by the old society to the new, far from diminishing, would have been augmented more and more; for wherever the law of brute force prevails, if it be not checked and softened by a powerful element, the human race becomes rapidly debased, the necessary result of which is the increase of slavery."

We shall not pretend however to follow in detail the course of doctrine and action, by which the Church continued to wrestle with this giant evil from century to century, until it fell finally

beneath the strength of her arms. The general process is thus recapitulated by Balme:

"First, she loudly teaches the truth concerning the dignity of man; she defines the obligations of masters and slaves; she declares them equal before God, and thus completely destroys the degrading theories which stain the writings even of the greatest philosophers of antiquity. She then comes to the application of her doctrines: she labors to improve the treatment of slaves; she struggles against the atrocious right of life and death; she opens her temples to them as asylums, and when they depart thence, prevents their being ill treated; she labors to substitute public tribunals for private vengeance. At the same time that she guarantees the liberty of the enfranchised, by connecting it with religious motives, she defends that of those born free, she labors to close the sources of slavery, by displaying the most active zeal for the redemption of captives, by opposing the avarice of the Jews, by procuring for men who were sold easy means of recovering their liberty. The Church gives an example of mildness and disinterestedness; she facilitates emancipation, by admitting slaves into monasteries and the ecclesiastical state; she facilitates it by all the other means that charity suggests; and thus it is, that in spite of the deep roots of slavery in ancient society—in spite of the perturbation caused by the irruption of the barbarians—in spite of so many wars and calamities of every kind, which in great measure paralyzed the effect of all regulating and beneficent action—we yet see slavery, that dishonor and leprosy of ancient civilization, rapidly diminish among christians, until it finally disappears. Certainly in all this we discover no plan conceived and concerted by men. But we do observe therein, in the absence of that plan, such unity of tendencies, such a perfect identity of views, and such similarity in the means, that we have the clearest demonstration of the civilizing and liberating spirit contained in Catholicity. Accurate observers will no doubt be gratified in beholding, in the picture which I have here exhibited, the admirable concord with which the period of the empire, that of the irruption of the barbarians, and that of feudality, all tended towards the same end. They will not regret the poor regularity which distinguishes the exclusive work of man; they will love, I repeat it, to collect all the facts scattered in seeming disorder, from the forests of Germany to the fields of Bœotia—from the banks of the Thames to those of the Tiber. I have not invented these facts; I have pointed out the periods, and cited the councils. The reader will find, at the end of the volume, in the original and in full, the texts

of which I have given an abstract or synopsis; thus he may fully convince himself that I have not deceived him."—"We may now inquire of M. Guizot what were the *other causes*, the *other ideas*, the *other principles of civilization*, the great development of which in his own words was necessary, 'to abolish this evil of evils, this iniquity of iniquities.'—Where is the idea, the custom, the institution, which, born on the outside of Christianity, contributed to the abolition of slavery? Let any one point out to us the epoch of its foundation, the time of its development; let him show us that it had not its origin in Christianity, and we will then confess that the latter cannot exclusively lay claim to the glorious title of having abolished that degraded condition; and he may be sure that this shall not prevent our exalting that idea, custom or institution, which took part in the great and noble enterprise of liberating the human race."—*P.* 114, 115.

There is only too much force in the following apostrophe, which is made eloquently to wind up the whole discussion, as directed towards a certain style of Protestantism that is ever ready to put itself forward as the whole interest in its true form. But we consider it, as already seen, a prostitution of this name; for its sympathies are against the honor of the Church and in league with infidelity and rationalism. The true Protestant faith rejoices in the glorious achievements of the old Catholic Church, and has no wish to rob her of a single leaf that belongs to the full foliage of her praise.

"We may be allowed now to inquire of the Protestant churches, of those ungrateful daughters, who, after having quitted the bosom of their mother, attempt to calumniate and dishonor her, Where were *you* when the Catholic Church accomplished in Europe the immense work of the abolition of slavery? and how can you venture to reproach her with sympathizing with servitude, degrading man, and usurping his rights? Can *you* then present any such claim, entitling you to the gratitude of the human race? What part can you claim in that great work, which prepared the way for the development and grandeur of European civilization? Catholicity alone, without your concurrence, completed the work; and she alone would have conducted Europe to its lofty destinies, if you had not come to interrupt the majestic march of its mighty nations, by urging them into a path bordered by precipices; a path, whose end is concealed by darkness which the eye of God alone can pierce."

True Protestantism of course cannot agree to this last thought, that the Reformation served only to interrupt the onward march

of civilization. It claims to be itself rather the proper legitimate succession and continuation of this glorious march. The precipices indeed are not to be disputed, and the darkness that shrouds the future is just now sufficiently appalling; but who shall say that all this is not the necessary condition of the general movement itself, a crisis that must needs be met and overcome in order to its full and final mastery of all the elements required to make it complete? The dangers that beset growth form no argument in favor of a perpetual childhood, however full of promise.

After having shown that it was Catholicity that removed the fundamental obstacle to all social progress, by cleansing Europe from the foul leprosy of slavery, our author goes on to consider its agency in the erection of the magnificent edifice itself which is now known by the name of European civilization; summing up first in brief statement its principal perfections, as follows:—“The individual animated by a lively sense of his own dignity, abounding in activity, perseverance, energy, and the simultaneous development of all his faculties; woman elevated to the rank of the consort of man, and as it were recompensed for the duty of obedience by the respectful regards lavished upon her; the gentleness and constancy of family ties, protected by the powerful guarantees of good order and justice; an admirable public conscience, rich in maxims of sublime morality, in laws of justice and equity, in sentiments of honor and dignity; a conscience which survives the shipwreck of private morality, and does not allow unblushing corruption to reach the height which it did in antiquity; a general mildness of manners, which in war prevents great excesses, and in peace renders life more tranquil and pleasing; a profound respect for man, and all that belongs to him, which makes private acts of violence very uncommon; and in all political constitutions serves as a salutary check on governments; an ardent desire of perfection in all departments; an irresistible tendency, sometimes ill-directed, but always active, to improve the condition of the many; a secret impulse to protect the weak, to succour the unfortunate—an impulse which sometimes pursues its course with generous ardor, and which, whenever it is unable to develop itself, remains in the heart of society, and produces there the uneasiness and inquietude of remorse; a cosmopolitan spirit of universality, of propagandism, an inexhaustible fund of resources to grow young again without danger of perishing, and for self-preservation in the most important junctures; a generous impatience, which longs to anticipate the future, and produces an incessant move-

ment and agitation, sometimes dangerous, but which are generally the germs of great benefits, and the symptoms of a strong principle of life. Such are the great characteristics which distinguish European civilization; such are the features which place it in a rank immensely superior to that of all other civilizations, ancient or modern."—*P.* 116.

"The mind, when contemplating European civilization, experiences so many different impressions, is attracted by so many objects, which at the same time claim its attention and preference, that, charmed by the magnificent spectacle, it is dazzled, and knows not where to commence the examination. The best way in such a case is to simplify, to decompose the complex object and reduce it to its simplest elements. *The individual, the family, and society*; these we have thoroughly to examine, and these ought to be the subjects of our inquiries. If we succeed in fully understanding these three elements, as they really are in themselves, and apart from the slight variations which do not effect their essence, European civilization, with all its riches and all its secrets, will be presented to our view, like a fertile and beautiful landscape lit up by the morning sun.—European civilization is in possession of the principal truths with respect to the individual, to the family, and to society; it is to this that it owes all that it is and all that it has. Nowhere have the true nature, the true relations and object of these three things been better understood than in Europe; with respect to them we have ideas, sentiments and views, which have been wanting in other civilizations. Now these ideas and feelings, strongly marked on the face of European nations, have inoculated their laws, manners, institutions, customs, and language; they are inhaled with the air, for they have impregnated the whole atmosphere with their vivifying aroma. To what is this owing? To the fact, that Europe, for many centuries, has had within its bosom a powerful principle, which preserves, propagates, and fructifies the truth; and it was especially in those times of difficulty, when the disorganized society had to assume a new form, that this regenerating principle had the greatest influence and ascendancy. Time has passed away, great changes have taken place, Catholicity has undergone vast vicissitudes in its power and influence on society; but civilization, its work, was too strong to be easily destroyed; the impulse which had been given to Europe was too powerful and well secured to be easily diverted from its course."—*P.* 117–118.

We have no room to follow the argument, in its treatment of these heads. On the subject of the *individual*, Balme takes up

Guizot's notion of the feeling of personal independence belonging to the Northern barbarians, as having been one of the chief and most productive principles of European civilization, and shows it to be a pure fiction. The barbarian sentiment, such as it was, far from being an element of civilization, wrought powerfully in favor only of disorder and barbarism. Neither is it true, that the ancient nations, and particularly the Greeks and Romans, as Guizot pretends, had no taste for personal independence, no sense of themselves as individual men. What they wanted was the comprehension of the true and proper dignity of man, the sense of human personality as it comes to light only by the Gospel. Among the ancients the individual was violently overwhelmed by society as the stronger body; thus the blindest submission and annihilation was closely joined with the spirit of insubordination and rebellion, ready to burst forth continually in the most terrible explosions. Christianity, by setting men consciously in a relation to God which was higher than that which bound them to the State, had a powerful tendency to promote the sense of personal responsibility and so of personal independence. To her influence therefore alone, to the glorious education of the Church, and not to any heritage of savage life, is to be ascribed beyond all doubt the new and vastly exalted conception of man's personal nature, that enters so largely into the modern civilization, and that forms in it so striking a contrast with all the civilizations that have gone before.

If the individual owes so much in this way to the influence of Catholicity, it is clear that the obligation is not less in the case of the family. The improvement of the last is necessarily conditioned indeed by the light in which the first is regarded. But it turns specially, we may say, on the proper elevation of woman. It is acknowledged now on all hands, that woman owes everything to Christianity. No one will pretend however, that the work accomplished by it in her favor dates only from the sixteenth century. It falls far back into those ages of darkness and disorder that went before. It forms part of the vast process, by which the structure of modern society was slowly raised out of the chaos of barbarism, centuries before Protestantism was born; and it is to be referred here plainly, not to any accidental agencies that may have had place on the outside of the Church, but altogether to her teaching and discipline, perseveringly maintained in opposition to the downward tendencies with which she was surrounded. It was her powerful authority in this way alone, which served to raise woman to her proper rank as the companion of man, to clothe the idea of marriage with its true

sanctity, to fix its necessary metes and bounds by excluding polygamy and divorce, and thus to place the domestic constitution on the high footing it is found to occupy in the modern world. "If we but read the history of the middle ages, of that immense scene of violence, where the barbarian, striving to break the bonds which civilization attempted to impose on him, appears so vividly; if we recollect that the Church was obliged to keep guard incessantly and vigilantly, not only to prevent the ties of marriage from being broken, but even to preserve virgins, (and even those who were dedicated to God.) from violence; we shall clearly see, that if she had not opposed herself as a wall of brass to the torrent of sensuality, the palaces of kings and the castles of seigneurs would have speedily become their seraglios and harems. And what would have happened in the other classes? They would have followed the same course; and the women of Europe would have remained in the state of degradation in which the Mussulman women still are." Guizot refers the improvement of the family to the feudal system, and it is fashionable with others, we know, to make the spirit of chivalry a main cause of the dignity to which woman has been advanced in modern society. But what power was it that brought this better sentiment to pass, in the bosom of the old barbarian life? "If the feudal lord, returning to his castle, found one wife there, and not many, to what was that owing? Who forbade him to abuse his power, by turning his house into a harem? Who bridled his passions, and prevented his making victims of his timid vassals? Surely these were the doctrines and morals introduced into Europe by the Catholic Church; it was the strict laws which she imposed as a barrier to the invasions of the passions; therefore even if we suppose that feudality did produce this good, it is owing still to the Catholic Church." Chivalry, instead of raising woman to the character of dignity it allows her, supposes her already raised and surrounded with respect. It has been attempted indeed to find the origin of its worship for her in the manners of the Germans, on the strength of some vague expressions used in regard to them by Tacitus. But even Guizot himself declares this to be of no force. Balnes shows it to be absolutely absurd. "I do not see," he says at the close of his examination, "why we should seek in the forests of the barbarians for the origin of one of the finest attributes of our civilization, or why we should give to those nations virtues of which they showed so little evidence when they invaded the countries of the south." And what heart that beats in unison with the only true religion, we ask, can wish to see it robbed of any portion of its proper credit in this way?

Centuries of laborious training enter into the constitution of our modern society. Here is opened at once to our view the beneficent agency of the Church, in the ages before the Reformation, on a scale of the most magnificent grandeur, the like of which, nay the most remote approximation to which, is nowhere else to be seen in the whole compass of human history. Superficial observers they must be indeed who cannot perceive this fact, or who fail to be affected by it with any sort of respect or admiration. It is something very wonderful, that the Church, through so long a series of centuries and in the midst of so much darkness and sin, should have handed down the work of theology, of christian doctrine, in so complete a form to modern times. That errors and corruptions should have gathered upon it, needing in the end to be set aside by wise reformation, is not strange; the only wonder is rather, that *all* fell not into hopeless falsehood and confusion. And yet every candid scholar knows that this was not the case. The grand lines and angles of the true christian faith, the foundations and columns of the temple of orthodox doctrine, however disfigured with the carvings and trappings of superstition, are a work wrought out and perpetuated for the use of the world before the Reformation; and the entire right which this has to be regarded as coming from God, rests on its being the necessary inward completion of that ancient faith and not its radical subversion. But the ethical work of the old church is full as grand and imposing, to say the least, as the dogmatic. Balmes refers here with great force to the "public conscience" of modern European society, so rich in sublime maxims of morality, in rules of justice and equity, in sentiments of honor and dignity; of which for the most part so little account is made, just because it flows around us on all sides like the air of heaven, but which needs only to be set in comparison with what we find in other orders of civilization, to give us an idea of its immense superiority.

"Modern society, it would seem, ought to have inherited the corruption of the old, since it was formed out of its ruins, at a time when its morals were most dissolute. We must observe, that the irruption of the barbarians, far from improving society, contributed on the contrary to make it worse; and this, not only on account of the corruption belonging to their fierce and brutal manners, but also on account of the disorder introduced among the nations they invaded, by violating laws, throwing their manners and customs into confusion, and destroying all authority. Whence it follows that the improvement of public opinion among modern nations is a very singular fact; and that this pro-

gress can only be attributed to the influence of the active and energetic principle, which has existed in the bosom of Europe for so many centuries."—*P.* 160.

It is easy enough to find disorders which this new civilization has never yet succeeded in bringing to an end; it is easy enough to find them in the bosom of the Church itself; but the true occasion for admiration is, that in such circumstances as we know to have attended her career she was not completely borne down and carried away by the tide of barbarism, that as a system her voice and arm were steadily exerted in favor of virtue and right, and that her power in this direction gradually brought to pass the magnificent moral result which we see accomplished at the close of these barbarous times.

Manners have been imbued in modern society with a certain gentleness and mildness, of which the civilization of the ancient world had no conception. Our author refers here to the public spectacles of the Romans, among other facts, in evidence of the brutal spirit with which they were animated; in which connection he is forced, as a Spaniard, to take some notice of the reproach cast upon his own country for her bull-fights. The practice is honestly condemned, whilst occasion is taken however to show that it is a very small abuse indeed as compared with the bloody tragedies of the old amphitheatre. Whence has the improvement of modern manners come? Manifestly from the Church. She was the fountain of order and law, when no conservative power besides could make itself felt. Age after age she wrestled with the wild passions of barbarous or half-barbarous men, laboring in all ways to subdue them to the idea of right and mercy, to put an end to violence, to make reason and justice of more force than blind self-will. Not only her doctrine, but her discipline also, was always powerfully turned in this direction. Ecclesiastical decrees and canons, passed by council after council, are still extant furnishing the most ample testimony to this fact. In all available ways, and at all times, we find this benign power, the genius of a new social creation, interposing its august sanctions on the side of the weak and defenceless against all sorts of lawlessness and wrong, offering itself as the asylum of the oppressed, and moulding the usages and sentiments of a barbarous period to the law of christian clarity and peace.

"In what spirit," our author exclaims after glancing at some examples here in point, "must they read the history of the Church, who do not feel the beauty of the picture presented to us by the multitude of regulations, scarcely indicated here, all

tending to protect the weak against the strong? The clergy and monks, on account of the weakness consequent on their peaceful profession, find in the canons which we have just quoted peculiar protection; but the same is granted to females, to pilgrims, to merchants, to villagers travelling or engaged in rural labors, and to beasts of labor—in a word, to all that is weak; and observe that this protection is not a mere passing effort of generosity, but a system practised in widely different places, continued for centuries, developed and applied by all the means that charity suggests—a system inexhaustible in resources and contrivances, both in producing good and in preventing evil. And surely it cannot be said that the Church was influenced in this by views of self-interest: what interested motive could she have in preventing the spoliation of an obscure traveller, the violence inflicted on a poor laborer, or the insult offered to a defenceless woman? The spirit which then animated her, whatever might be the abuses which were introduced during unhappy times, was as it now is the spirit of God himself—that spirit which continually communicates to her so marked an inclination towards goodness and justice, and always urges her to realize by any possible means her sublime desires. I leave the reader to judge, whether or not the constant efforts of the Church to banish the dominion of force from the bosom of society were likely to improve manners.”—*P.* 183.

The amelioration of manners is closely connected with the spirit of public beneficence. This was unknown among the ancients. Individuals may have been beneficent in some instances, but all public charity was wanting. No regard was had by society as such to the unfortunate. Hence, among other abuses, infanticide and slavery prevailed on all sides. The Church set her face steadily against these evils. But the case required far more than this. A vast system of charitable sentiment and charitable action was to be formed in the bosom of society, directed towards the relief and support of all classes of the indigent and wretched. Our familiarity with this now prevents us from seeing its greatness and difficulty. Let us however transport ourselves in thought to the time when all was unknown, when there was not even the first idea of beneficence in any such form, and we may then be able to do some justice perhaps to the merits of that mighty spiritual agent through which so great a work was brought to pass. “It is one thing to found and maintain an establishment of this kind, when a great number of similar ones already exist—when governments possess immense resources, and strength sufficient to protect all interests; but it is

a very different thing to establish a multitude of them in all places, when there is no model to be copied, when it is necessary to *improvise* in a thousand ways the indispensable resources—when public authority has no *prestige* or force to control the violent passions that struggle to gain every thing on which they can feed. Now in modern times, since the existence of Protestantism, the first only of these things has been done; the second was accomplished centuries before by the Catholic Church; and let it be observed, that what has been done in Protestant countries in favor of public beneficence, has been done by acts of government, acts which were necessarily inspired by the view of the happy results already obtained from similar institutions.”

Hospitals, and other kindred institutions, come into view from the earliest times, under the charge of the bishops, and as an object of special canonical legislation. The learned know what the ancient *diaconies* were—places of charity, where poor widows, orphans, old men, and other unfortunate persons, found refuge and support. The irruption of the barbarians tended to overthrow all previous provisions for the relief of the poor, while it multiplied misery and want in every direction. Did the Church succumb to this torrent of desolation? By no means. She only girded herself with new zeal to the task she had before assumed. She proclaimed herself continually the guardian of the poor and needy. She made every effort to save the property which had been before consecrated to their use, and set herself to devise new means and ways for their relief, answerable always to the new forms of want with which she was surrounded. The evidence of this abounds in the canons of councils, held in the most unsettled and barbarous times. In the sixth century, we find regulations requiring every town to maintain its own poor. Lepers are placed under the special care of the bishops, who must see that they were provided with food and clothing out of the church funds. “Zeal for improving the condition of prisoners, a kind of charity which has been so much displayed in modern times, is extremely ancient in the Church. In the sixth century there was already an inspector of prisons; the archdeacon or the provost of the church was obliged to visit prisoners on all Sundays; no class of criminals was excluded from the benefit of this solicitude. The archdeacon was bound to learn their wants, and to furnish them, by means of a person recommended by the bishop, with food and all they stood in need of. This was ordered by the 20th canon of the council of Orleans held in 549.” These are only hints of what was done by the Church in the service of charity, through the long night of the

Middle Ages. Errors and abuses may have attended the work in some of its details. But it is a miserable spirit that can be blinded by these to the majesty that belongs to it as a whole, or that is hindered in this way from seeing and acknowledging the stupendous result to which it has led in the sum total of what we call modern civilization.

A truly beautiful and sublime exemplification of the benevolent spirit of the Church, is presented to us by the religious orders for the redemption of captives instituted in the thirteenth century. Through all previous ages, as we have before seen, this object was one that lay specially near to the catholic heart. In the period now mentioned however it acquired a peculiar prominence, by reason of the long wars in which the Christian world had come to be involved with the Infidels. "In consequence of these, a very great number of the faithful groaned in fetters, deprived of their liberty and country, and often in danger of apostatizing from the faith of their fathers. The Moors still occupied a considerable part of Spain; they reigned exclusively on the coasts of Africa, and proudly triumphed in the East, where the Crusaders had been vanquished. The Infidels thus held the south of Europe closely confined, and were constantly able to seize favorable moments, and procure multitudes of christian slaves. The revolutions and disorders of those times continually offered favorable opportunities; both hatred and cupidity urged them to gratify their revenge on the christians taken unawares. We may be sure that this was one of the severest scourges, which the human race had to endure at that time in Europe." If charity was to be anything more than a mere name, here was a case certainly which it had no right to overlook; and rude and dark as the times were, we find the spirit of religion spontaneously setting itself in motion on a grand scale for its relief. It gives birth to the idea of a vast association, which reaching through different countries might become a general repository for the alms of such as wished to assist in so good a work, while it should have in its service a certain number of persons always ready to traverse the seas, and brave every danger, for the redemption of their brethren in captivity. Such was the want, such the idea of what was needed to meet it; and, lo! the "Orders for the Redemption of Captives," the holy institutes of Mercy and of the Trinity, as they were called, make their appearance. Devoted men are seized with the idea of consecrating, not only their property, but their entire persons, to the service of christian charity in this great work. Around them rally others of similar spirit. "The religious who em-

braced these orders bound themselves by vow to the work for which they were formed. Free from the embarrassments of family relations and worldly interests, they could devote themselves to their task with all the ardor of their zeal. Long voyages, the perils of the sea, the danger of unhealthy climates, or the ferocity of the Infidels—nothing stopped them. In their dress, in the prayers of their institution, they found a constant remembrance of the vow which they had taken in the Divine presence. Neither repose, comfort, nor even their very lives, any longer belong to them; all are become the property of the unhappy captives, who groan in the dungeons or wear heavy chains in the presence of their masters, on the other side of the Mediterranean. The families of the unhappy victims, fixing their eyes on the religious, required of him the accomplishment of his promise; their groans and lamentations continually urge him to find means, and to expose his life if necessary, to restore the father to the son, the son to the father, the husband to the wife, the innocent young girl to her desolate mother.”

Must we obstinately close our eyes to the loveliness of this whole picture, because it belongs to the “dark ages,” because it rests under the full shadow of the Papacy, because it is linked with the idea of celibacy and monastic vows, because we find it enveloped historically in a nimbus of superstition? God forbid. We hail it rather as a glorious commentary on the power of Christianity; we feel ourselves spiritually moved and quickened by the evidence it affords of the Saviour’s presence among his people, the argument it supplies thus for the truth of his religion. Why should we make less of it in this view than we make of the zeal of the early martyrs—which, we know well enough, was by no means pure and perfect always in its associations? Why should we make less of it even than we make of the sacrifices and efforts of modern Protestant benevolence; which in the shape of Missionary Societies, Bible Societies, Tract Societies, &c., is regarded by many as completely eclipsing in liberality all that the world has ever known of charity through all ages before? How many of our Tabernacle orators after all, who fill the land every second week in May with the glorification of this theme, are willing themselves to become missionaries to the heathen even as the world now stands; and yet where are the cases now, in which the sacrifices and perils of the missionary life, all deserving of honor as it is, can at all be compared with what was involved in the service of those who gave themselves up, in the way here shown, to the work of rescuing their fellow christians from captivity in the thirteenth century!

It is fashionable to charge the Church with having been, before the Reformation, the enemy of science and civil liberty. To listen to some, we might suppose that she was no better than an organized conspiracy against the most precious rights of mankind, under this form, from the sixth century down to the sixteenth. Had she only been out of the way, so that men might have been left simply to the guidance of the Bible and private judgment, whole centuries of darkness and confusion, it seems to be imagined, might have been happily avoided, and the course of modern civilization hastened perhaps a thousand years. The writer before us shows we think very triumphantly, that the common slang of Pseudo-protestantism on this subject, is fully as much at war with the voice of true history as it is with the spirit of true religion. It is simply slanderous and false, to say that the Church has been during the middle ages the enemy either of knowledge or of freedom, or that her influence was exerted systematically and intentionally to keep back the progress of light and civilization. She was the guardian emphatically of all the higher interests of society. The state of the world, and her relation to it, made it necessary indeed that she should assume powers and exercise an authority, which were not to be measured exactly by any ordinary rule. This however proceeded not so much from any spirit of usurpation on her part, as from the mere presence of a social void and want that could be filled from no other quarter and in no other way. "The temporal power of the Popes was strengthened and extended at a time, when no other power was as yet really constituted. To call that power usurpation therefore is not merely an inaccuracy—it is an anachronism. In the general confusion brought upon all European society by the irruptions of the barbarians, in that strange medley of races, laws, manners and traditions, there remained only one solid foundation for the structure of the edifice of civilization and refinement, only one luminous body to shine upon the chaos, only one element capable of giving life to the germ of regeneration that lay buried in blood stained ruins; Christianity, predominant over and annihilating the remains of other religions, arose in this age of desolation like a solitary column in the centre of a ruined city, or like a bright beacon amid darkness." The barbarians bowed to the authority of this power, as the only one that carried in it any principle of order, or that offered any promise of stability. "Wars succeeded to wars, convulsions to convulsions, the forms of society were continually changing; but the one great general and dominant fact, the stability and influence of religion, remained still the same: and it

is ridiculous in any man to declaim against a phenomenon so natural, so inevitable, and above all so advantageous, designating it a succession of usurpations of temporal power." Where all was chaos, there could be properly no usurpation. The right to rule fell where there was ability to rule. It is dishonest to try such times by the standard of a settled and well ordered social state. The power to regenerate society, in the middle ages, lay wholly in the Church. On her devolved accordingly, as by Divine commission, the sovereign care of society and the duty of training it for its proper destiny. Was this providential trust then abused in its actual administration? Did the Church exercise her guardianship over the infant nations of Europe, in such a way as instead of assisting to repress their upward tendencies, in such a way as to retard rather than to advance their progress in true civilization? We have seen already that she was a fountain of order and law; that she brought society into regular and settled form; that she caused the wilderness to become a fruitful field; that she curbed the passions of men, and set bounds to their violence; that she led them to dwell in families, and to cultivate the domestic virtues; that she inoculated manners with a new spirit of gentleness and peace; that she raised the standard of morality, and purified the public conscience, far beyond all that was known in the ancient world; that she established a reign and fashion of benevolence, such as had not previously entered the wildest dreams of philanthropy. We have seen all this, and have felt that a power so employed could not well be at war with the best interests of humanity. But was it after all the power only of a humane and well disposed master towards his slaves, or say even of a father towards his sons, who at the same time is bent on holding them always in full subjection to his own will, and so takes care that their education shall not be allowed to lead them either to the knowledge or to the free use of their personal rights? Did this Holy Mother, in the midst of all her wonderfully powerful and salutary educational activity, still show herself faithless and selfish in the whole trust, by resisting the general diffusion of knowledge and the legitimate progress of freedom? The supposition is in its own nature most unnatural and improbable, and to compare it with history, as already said, is at once to find it absolutely false. The Church has never been the deliberate enemy either of liberty or of letters.

Here naturally rises at once the thought of the religious intolerance so often charged to the account of the old Catholic Church, the persecutions she has allowed against heretics and

infidels, the horrors in particular of the Inquisition. "It is only necessary to pronounce the word intolerance," says Balmes, "to raise in the minds of some people all sorts of black and horrible ideas." Institutions and men of past times are condemned without appeal, the moment they come under the sound of this reproach. No pains are taken for the most part to understand the real posture of the past, or to judge it according to its own connections and relations. And yet what can be more unfair than this? How easily may any institution be covered with disgrace, if only its inconveniences and evils are brought into view and every consideration suppressed that might speak in its favor. By fixing on certain points only in the annals of the human mind, the history of science may be made the history of folly, and even of crime. So in the case before us. "The spirit of the age, particular circumstances, and an order of things quite different from ours, are all forgotten, and the history of the religious intolerance of Catholics is composed by taking care to condense into a few pages, and to paint in the blackest colors," cases of cruelty and severity diligently collected from different countries and centuries. Events wide apart are made to unite in a single impression, without the least regard to intervening scenery. It is easy in this way to bring out wholesale judgments. But such judgments are of small account in the end for the cause of truth. This question of toleration too, as all thinking men know, is in its own nature by no means of so easy settlement as this summary way of looking at the matter implies. Without entering into it here however, it is enough to know that a wide difference in regard to it has come to exist between the present time and the past. A spirit of toleration now prevails, right or wrong, which in former ages was unknown. But is this due to Protestantism, or as is sometimes said to modern philosophy? Not at all. It is a fact slowly brought to pass by the force of circumstances. "The multitude of religions, infidelity, indifference, the improvement of manners; the lassitude produced by wars,—industrial and commercial organization, which every day becomes more powerful in society,—communication rendered more frequent among men by means of travelling—the diffusion of ideas by the press; such are the causes which have produced in Europe that universal tolerance which has taken possession of all, and has been established in fact when it could not be by law. These causes, as it is easy to observe, are of different kinds; no doctrine can pretend to an exclusive influence; they are the result of a thousand different influences, acting simultaneously on the development of civilization."

We are glad to see, that while our author protests against the injustice of trying the opinions and institutions of past ages by the altogether different order of thought that has come to prevail in our own, and finds a relative apology even for the tribunal of the Inquisition itself in the social circumstances under which it appeared and prevailed, he does not feel himself bound at all to make common cause with the crimes that have been perpetrated in the name of christianity against supposed heretics. "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew," he tells us, "and other atrocities committed in the name of religion, ought not to trouble the apologists of religion. To render her responsible for all that has been done in her name, would be to act with manifest injustice. Man is endowed with so strong and lively a sense of the excellence of virtue, that he endeavors to cover the greatest crimes with her mantle; would it be reasonable to banish virtue from the earth on that account? There are, in the history of mankind, terrible periods, where a fatal giddiness seizes upon the mind; rage, influenced by disorder, blinds the intellect and changes the heart; evil is called good, and good evil; the most horrible attempts are made under the most respectable names. Historians and philosophers, in treating of such periods, should know what ought to be their line of conduct; strictly accurate in the narration of such facts, they ought to beware of drawing from them a judgment as to the prevailing ideas and institutions. Society then resembles a man in a state of delirium. We should ill judge of the ideas, character and conduct, of such a man, from what he says and does in that deplorable condition. What party, in such calamitous times, can boast of not having committed great crimes? If we fix our eyes on the period just mentioned, do we not see the leaders of both parties assassinated by treason?—Let us throw a veil over these catastrophes, over these afflicting proofs of the misery and perversity of the human heart."—*P.* 204.

It is noted as a curious fact, well worthy of serious consideration, that the charge of being hostile to the right political progress of society has been brought against Catholicity, at different times, from directly opposite points of view. Formerly the fashion was to represent it as the enemy of kings, because it made the seat of power to be primarily in the people, and taught that temporal sovereigns may be resisted if need be, in certain circumstances, even to the extent of revolution itself. But since the revolutionary spirit has come to be in the ascendant, that old tone is found to be widely changed; and the very same power that was held before to be at the bottom of a conspiracy against

all other thrones, in favor of the universal supremacy of the Pope, is now declared to be in league with the general cause of monarchy to crush and kill every motion of liberty among the people. The radicals of Europe, we know, are full of this cry; and among ourselves also it may be said to be a reigning opinion, that the religious power in question is constitutionally opposed to everything like republicanism, and it is easily taken for granted accordingly that it has entered into an infamous pact with kings to oppress, enslave, and degrade the unfortunate human race. We pretend not here to try at all the true merits of this latter judgment. We refer to it simply as something curiously in contrast with the other reproach of an earlier time.

But whatever may be the actual spirit of Rome as it now stands, it is perfectly certain that the reigning influence of the Church, in the ages before the Reformation, went in favor of sound political liberty throughout, and that it was under her auspices mainly and especially that this interest gained ground continually more and more in the onward course of modern civilization. This is very successfully shown, we think, in the latter portion of Balmes' work; and we only wish that these chapters in particular might be read and studied by those, who without any historical knowledge whatever so flippantly pretend to settle the whole subject in just the contrary way. Here are facts, which these wholesale revilers of religion would do well at least to look in the face, if it were only to set aside the force they *seem* to have, and thus show their own zeal to be intelligent where it is now so deplorably blind.

The great problem in politics, is to determine the proper relation between authority and freedom, the idea of duties in one direction and the idea of rights in another. This connects itself again closely with the question, *What is the origin of civil power?* It so happens that a good deal of attention has come to be fixed on this subject, just at the present time in our own country, by the late action of the General Government in regard to slavery. In one direction, we hear views maintained, in the name of individual conscience, that go to upset civil authority altogether. These proceed openly or tacitly on the assumption, that government is a mere social contract on the part of the people, to be set aside by them at their own pleasure. On the opposite side it is more soundly contended, that government comes from God, and that obedience to it is a duty for its own sake; though it must be confessed that this doctrine, in the hands at least of some of its republican advocates, is pressed so far as to sound very much like a revival of the old "divine right" theory

of kings, (commonly taken heretofore to have gone to the tomb of the Capulets,) and savors strongly of being the fruit of Political Economy, rather than the genuine outbirth of Political Ethics. But now, be this as it may, one thing is certain. This whole better doctrine, of which the *New York Observer* for instance has been making a merit over against the too consistently Puritan tendency of the *N. Y. Independent*, and for the defence of which more than one eloquent preacher has succeeded in winning golden compliments from Daniel Webster and other distinguished civilians, is one that belongs in all its fulness to the old Catholic Church of the middle ages, and that was applied by her to the development of the present civilization of Europe, we may say from the very start, not in a blind and clumsy form, but with a depth and breadth of discrimination the like of which is not to be found anywhere in the best of these modern efforts.

The Church has ever disowned the idea of a social contract, as lying at the foundation of government. Civil power, she tells us, comes from God, and is to be obeyed from a regard to his will. The old writers are full of the most clear instruction in regard to all this. Aquinas in particular, it would seem, has explained and guarded the subject on all sides in the most masterly way.

On the other hand however, this divine right of government is not taken to be the special prerogative of a class, rulers separately considered, but is made to spring from the political body in its general character. The common doctrine of the church has been, that such power resides in the community directly and by natural right, but in kings and other rulers merely indirectly and by human right, unless God has given it to particular persons by his own direct nomination. No mistake can be greater, than that by which the exaggeration of the authority of rulers, at the cost of popular rights, is held to be the natural and necessary doctrine of Catholicism, as distinguished from the genius of Protestantism. History plainly teaches a different lesson. It was Protestantism in the beginning of its career, that stood forward strangely enough as the flatterer and helper of kings. In its opposition to the Papacy, it was led naturally to exalt to an incredible degree the pretensions of the civil power. This was appealed to against the religious power, and encouraged to usurp the supreme control of ecclesiastical affairs. The regal authority was thus assisted powerfully in the direction it had already begun to take, through the decline of the feudal system and the still unripe character of the popular element, towards an undue absorption into itself of all other political forces. It became the

fashion to insist on the divine right of kings, as coming directly from God without the intervention of society. How far this theory was carried in Protestant England, we need not be told; the influence of it however was felt throughout Europe generally; and it is easy enough to see that it stood in close connection everywhere with the protest which was now made against the supremacy of the Church. We find the Catholic theologians accordingly vigorously opposing it as dangerous and false.

"Political power," says Bellarmin, "emanates from God alone; for being necessarily annexed to man's nature, it proceeds from Him who has made that nature. It resides primarily in the body of the people. The divine right has not given it to any man in particular. The people transfer it to one person or more by natural right. Particular forms of government accordingly are by the law of nations, and not by divine law, since it depends on the consent of the multitude to place over themselves a king, consuls, or other magistrates, as may seem best; and for a legitimate reason, they can change royalty into aristocracy, or into democracy, or *vice versa*, as it was done in Rome." To King James of England this doctrine sounded monstrous in the extreme. He said to his parliament: "that God had appointed him absolutely master; and that all privileges which co-legislative bodies enjoyed were pure concessions proceeding from the bounty of kings." Against Bellarmin's doctrine he showed himself all on fire, contending that kings hold their power *not* from the people, but *immediately* from God; for all which his supple courtiers proclaimed him a second Solomon. This called out the learned Spanish Jesuit Suarez, in his "Defence of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of the Anglican Sect," with special reference to *the most serene James, King of England*—addressed to the most serene Kings and Princes generally of the christian world. In this work the view of Bellarmin is ably supported as true and just, whilst the English doctrine is treated as new and singular, and as having been invented apparently to exalt the temporal over the spiritual power. The whole case furnishes a curious illustration of the political bearings of the Catholic and Protestant systems at the time in question, so different from what is often taken to be their respective necessary tendencies and affinities.

The separation of the temporal and spiritual powers, and the independence of the latter with respect to the former, have had much to do no doubt with the formation of that spirit of liberty which is characteristic of modern civilization. "Ever since the foundation of the Church, this principle of the independence of

the spiritual power has at all times served, by the mere fact of its existence, to remind men that the rights of civil power are limited, that there are things beyond its province, cases in which a man may say, and ought to say, *I will not obey.*" Strange that the advocates of equilibrium and counterpoise, who make so much of the policy of dividing powers to prevent tyranny, should not have felt the profound wisdom of this old church doctrine even in a simply political view. But we find, on the contrary, that all modern revolutions have shown a decided tendency towards the amalgamation of the civil and ecclesiastical powers; "a convincing proof," as Balmes shrewdly observes, "that these revolutions have proceeded from an origin *contrary* to the generative principle of European civilization, and that instead of guiding it towards perfection, they have rather served to lead it astray."

It is historically certain, that European society as a whole, in the period before the Reformation, was steadily advancing in the direction of a rational safe liberty. The problem by which the several interests of the throne, the aristocracy, and the mass of the people, were to be rightly guarded and carried forward in the onward movement of civilization, so as by just harmony to serve and not hinder the true welfare of all, was one of vast difficulty, which however in the face of manifold disturbing forces we may see still approximating at least more and more towards its own full and proper solution. The simple position of these several elements relatively to each other, at the going out of the middle ages, is of itself enough to show how false it is to represent the old Catholicity as the enemy of popular liberty; for we see that European civilization at this time, after having been for so many centuries under the sole guardianship of that power, presented no one of these interests as exclusively predominant. "Survey the whole of Europe, and you will not find one country in which the same fact did not exist. In Spain, France, England, Germany, under the names of Cortes, States-General, Parliaments, or Diets; the same thing everywhere, with the simple modifications which necessarily result from circumstances adapted to each people. And what is very remarkable in this case is, that if there be a single exception it is in favor of liberty; and strange to say, this exists precisely in Italy, where the influence of the Popes is immediately felt. The names of the Republics of Genoa, Pisa, Sienna, Florence, Venice, are familiar to all. It is well known that Italy is the country in which popular forms at that period gained most ground, and in which they were put in practice when in other countries

they had already abandoned the field.—These forms of government were attended indeed with grave inconveniences ; but since so much is said of *spirit* and *tendencies*, since the Catholic Church is reproached with her affinity to despotism, and the Popes with a taste for oppression, it is well to adduce these facts as suited to throw some doubt on the confident assertions oftentimes paraded as so many philosophico-historical dogmas on this subject."

We have no room to say more than a word on the other current topic of reproach, the alledged unfriendliness of the church before the Reformation to the cause of literature and science. No one who has any knowledge of history will deny that a very active interest had begun to be taken in the general cause of knowledge before this time. The movements of it enter largely into the whole culture of Europe as it now stands. But will it be imagined in any quarter, that this spirit came from the outside of the Church, and prevailed against her pleasure and in spite of her authority ? To ask the question is to show its absurdity. The intellectual development of modern Europe started under an exclusively theological form. Religion formed the element, out of which it sprang and from which it drew all its activity and force. Whatever we find to be then its advancing history, it must be regarded as the product of this power, and the merit of it must be placed to its account. There were indeed tendencies almost from the beginning of the movement, that set themselves in more or less direct opposition to the Church, and on which accordingly she laid to some extent her restraining hand. But it is notorious that these were of no value comparatively for the cause of true learning. What was done for it by all the unchurchly sects of the middle ages ? Who believes seriously that *they* had any power whatever in themselves to be helpers truly to such a cause, under any circumstances ? Guizot quotes John Erigena, Roscelin, and Abelard, as the representatives of a reaction of the individual reason against the authority of the Church, which is supposed to have commenced in their time and to have reached forward to the age of Luther, as a sort of new and separate power exerted in favor of knowledge and free thought. But this comes to mere idle declamation in the end. What actual result of real lasting account for the progress of mind can be shown to have proceeded from any such quarter, as compared with what was accomplished by the action of the proper church life itself in favor of the same interest ? The greatest scholars in these ages of waking intelligence, the men whose influence contributed most to the progress of all

sound science, were at the same time the most faithful sons of the Church, and such as owned the most dutiful allegiance to her authority and power.

It is a most childish fancy certainly, to suppose that the revival of learning began properly with the sixteenth century. It dates at least from the eleventh; and there is abundance of evidence that the progress made between that and the age of the Reformation, was quite as real and important as any that has taken place since. All sorts of learning were in active exercise before Protestantism came in, to share their credit with the Roman Church. So in the case of criticism, controversy, and the learned languages, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. "Anthony de Nebrija, Erasmus, Ludovicus Vives, Laurence Villa, Leonardus Aretinus, Bembo, Sadolet, Poggio, Melchior Cano, and many others too numerous to mention; were they trained in Protestantism? Did not the Popes, moreover, take the lead in this literary movement? Who patronized the learned with greater liberality? Who supplied them with more abundant resources? Who incurred greater expenses in the purchase of the best manuscripts?"—"In Italy the study of Greek was first seriously commenced; from Italy it spread to France, and to the other European States." Reuchlin and Picus de Mirandula, the great promoters of a taste for Greek and Hebrew, were Catholics. As early as the beginning of the fourteenth century indeed, Pope Clement V., had ordained that Greek and Hebrew, and even Arabic and Chaldee, should be publicly taught, for the benefit of foreigners, at Rome, at Paris, at Oxford, at Bologna, and at Salamanca.¹

¹ "One of the causes which contributed the most to the development of the human mind was the creation of great centres of instruction, collecting the most illustrious talents and learning, and diffusing rays of light in all directions. I know not how men could forget that this idea was not due to the pretended Reformation, seeing that most of the universities of Europe were established long before the birth of Luther. That of Oxford was founded in 895; Cambridge in 1280; that of Prague, in Bohemia, in 1358; that of Louvain, in Belgium, in 1425; that of Vienna, in Austria, in 1365; that of Ingolstadt, in Germany, in 1372; that of Leipsic, in 1408; that of Basle, in Switzerland, in 1469; that of Salamanca, in 1200; that of Alcalá, in 1517. It would be superfluous to notice the antiquity of the universities of Paris, of Bologna, of Ferrara, and of a great many others, which obtained the highest renown long before the advent of Protestantism. The Popes, it is well known, took an active part in the establishment of universities, granting them privileges, and bestowing upon them the highest honors and distinctions. How can any one then venture to assert, that Rome has opposed the progress of learning and the sciences, in order to keep the people in darkness and ignorance."—*Balmes*, p. 415.

The whole object of our Spanish author, as we have before said, is to bring out an argument against Protestantism, from a comparison of its influence with that of Catholicism, as both have been felt in the work of modern civilization. In this comparison however the book is extremely onesided and incomplete; not by the exaggeration of the merits of Catholicism as this stood before the age of the Reformation, but by the want of a correspondingly full and thorough analysis of the actual results of Protestantism. It seems to be assumed throughout, that whatever tells positively in favor of the course of things before Protestantism appeared, must be taken to tell negatively for this cause since; as though both orders of life might not contribute, in different periods, to the progress of one and the same movement. Then the eye of the writer is ever on the *excesses* into which the protest against authority is running, particularly in Europe at this time, in the form of rationalism and political radicalism; which are indeed just now sufficiently alarming, but still do not at once amount to a philosophical solution of the whole meaning and value of the general movement from which they incidentally spring. They *may* be, (God grant it), a crisis only, opening the way into a brighter era beyond. And might it not have been necessary to meet and overcome the same, in some other form, even if the progress of modern culture could have gone forward without the church rupture of the 16th century? Our American society, and so of course also the new "American Epoch" which is dawning on the history of Protestantism by means of it, Balmes may be said entirely to overlook. His vision is altogether engrossed with the social difficulties and dangers of Europe.

It is easy enough, of course, to place the comparative influence of the two systems in question, on the progress of civilization, under a very different historical view, that shall be felt to tell powerfully in favor of Protestantism and against Rome. This does not require us to vilify and disparage the Church of previous ages. We allow it rather all the merit here claimed for it, as the founder and builder of modern society on to the sixteenth century. The question regards the *continuation* of the work since. Protestantism, in its true form, proclaims itself, not the destroyer of the older work, but its proper finisher, or at least its necessary helper towards completion. It is to be taken as itself, in such view, the greatest birth of the Latin Church, (such as the dead Greek communion never could produce,) and so the truest and best succession also of its old life; by the power of which palpably the main stream of history has gone for-

ward, since the age of the Reformation. Under such view, and within such range, the historical parallel between the two systems, we say, may very easily be turned impressively in favor of Protestantism.

Who can well help feeling the force, for instance, of the following picture of the influence of the Church of Rome, from the eloquent pen of Macaulay: "During the last three centuries to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has every where been in the inverse proportion to her misguided power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude and intellectual torpor; while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what four hundred years ago they actually were, should now compare the country around Rome with the country around Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation; the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality; in Switzerland, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton; in Ireland, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent around them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise."¹

¹ Compare with this a fine passage to the same effect, in Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*, p. 96-98. "Traverse the lands in which Protestantism has fixed its seat," says the author, "from the northern boundary of Sweden to the Sandwich Islands, from the southern declivities of the Himalayah to the banks of the Mississippi; almost everywhere you may find theologians victoriously contending against infidelity and superstition; preachers, who like Paul are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ Crucified, but hold all the glory

The force of this comparison would seem to be very plain; and we can only wonder therefore, when we find such a man as Brownson treating it as a nullity, or worse still insisting that the social state of Protestant countries is less sound and promising than that of Spain for instance, or Austria, or France. "In all Protestant nations," he tells us lately, "faith is gone, morality is gone, and principle is gone. The least depraved among them may vie not unsuccessfully, in immorality and unnatural crimes, with the more depraved nations of heathen antiquity" (*Review for Jan. 1851, p. 106*). To talk at this rate is not to argue but to rail. Mere material prosperity, we grant, is no sure sign or proof of true social improvement; and it is plain enough that the forces which at present make up the reigning power of what may be called our Protestant civilization, in Europe and in this country, will never be able with such form and direction as they now have to bring society to its right end. The higher power of religion, the moulding and controuling agency of the Church, in a way not now known, must come in to save the whole process from confusion and defeat. Protestantism itself needs a mighty regeneration, a new creation we may say, to fulfil in the end its own most critical and perilous mission. But all this may not blind us to the clear fact, that a real onward impulse has been communicated by it notwithstanding to the life of the modern world. This in itself considered is a gain, however much may be wanting still to make it complete; and as far as it goes may be justly quoted always, as a fair and legitimate argument in favor of the Protestant cause.

J. W. N.

of the world in contempt for its sake; a strict moral order; a blooming domestic life; a familiarity with the Bible; an inward freedom and joy of faith; such as you may seek in vain in the very centre itself of the Church of Rome. There is still sufficient salt in the system, with all its diseases, to save it from corruption.—Only blindness itself can deny, that Protestantism still continues the great moving power of the time; holding the helm of the world's political and spiritual history; whilst every other form of action comes to have deep significance only as standing with it in either hostile or friendly relation." If the cause of Protestantism is to be successfully maintained at all, it must be on the general ground taken in this tract; than which, we hesitate not to say, no more *honest* or able plea for it has ever yet appeared in our country.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MAY, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. III.

THE VALUE OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

IN attempting to penetrate the spirit of American Institutions, to explain the phenomena, which they present, and to show the relative position of American civilization in the history of the world, it is improper to suppose that these things have taken place in some accidental manner,—that the outcasts of the old world, carried by some fortunate wind to the American shores, and favored by some undefined influence of our hills and vallies, our fountains and streams, commenced the superstructure of American culture, of American government, and American enterprise. So too it is equally as absurd to trace our American life to the noble spirits, that figured so extensively in our early history, as if it were owing to their originality, or powers of invention, that we have been made to occupy our present position in the history of the world. Our historic characters, or great men, and we have such as have made an impression on the world, were the embodiment of a spirit, that was not peculiar to them, but which was shared with them by others in distant lands; and how could they have been its originators? The time-spirit would disdain so recent an origin; it comes to us from afar, from the wreck of ancient, and venerated institutions; from the ruins of empires, from the tomb of former glory, and bears in its

VOL. III.—NO. III. 14°

bosom all that is precious, or valuable,—every germ of life, that lingered in the remains of effete forms of humanity. The forces of history, extending from country to country, from age to age, meeting with inflexible opposition every strange element, overthrowing, establishing, or modifying, until the aspect of human affairs have undergone an entire change, may well throw the noise and uproar of human passion into the back-ground. As America is now admitted to have come into the general whole of history, it must have been called into existence by laws as necessary and unchangeable, as those which control the planets above, or the hidden powers below. If such a connection between our life and the past, can be made to appear, it will serve to enhance the value of our existence in the eyes of all intelligent persons, to encourage an enlightened patriotism, and to discourage a narrow-minded national vanity, that is springing up among us.

In the four celebrated empires of antiquity, the centralization of power, operated with almost omnipotent force, as if this were the vanishing point of human life. In the Roman Empire it received its highest development, when the known world was held beneath the sway of a single hand. When this latter colossus of human power began to crumble into atoms, it was succeeded by the rise of another idea, pointing in the same direction, which was exhibited in the papacy. Previously the tendency of the times was an objective one, but this objectivity was to be gained by external power as in the case of civil government. The world sought to be united in an external organization, and in this way to find its consummation. At the rise of the papacy this objective tendency continued, but began to move in a more spiritual and inward way. The idea of the age was to unite men by the established religion, by creeds, by an ecclesiastical organization and laws, over which the priesthood should exercise dominion. The reigning idea of the middle ages, consequently, was the establishment of the Catholic Church. No event of importance took place, which had not some connection, directly or indirectly, with the propagation of spiritual power in the bishop of Rome. This was supposed to be an all absorbing interest of men. Nothing was considered valuable, which did not subserve the purposes of the hierarchy. The pope, and the priesthood were the adoration of the multitude, and the source of all temporal and spiritual blessings. Civil government became subject to the spiritual power. Literature and Science were alike enslaved to the ruling idea. Authority, and not investigation, was the order of the day. A more subjective ten-

dency, that was manifested in different directions, claiming the rights of freedom, was driven to the mountains, or burnt with faggots. Private judgment was dispensed with ; the Pope was infallible, and Emperors bowed at his palace, and humbly supplicated his favor.

Now it cannot be said that such almost superhuman efforts after the unity of the race, did not carry within them some degree of relative justification. Had they not possessed some shadow of righteousness, they never could have been put forth. There remains in man, as a relic of his primitive condition, a feeling after unity with his fellows,—a dim intuition, that his present distracted and divided condition, is not the will of the Creator, and that when the golden age returns to bless the world, the present divisions of men shall be healed, and he shall be one with himself. In the heathen world this was doubtless a vague feeling, that mingled with a host of selfish motives and passions. In the Catholic Church it came into a clearer consciousness. Christianity had taught men, what they dimly felt, that unity was a duty, and one aspect of the sanctified condition of the world ; consequently, they believed they were doing God-service in the bitter persecution of the times,—in stifling the better tendencies that were beginning to appear, with the view of upholding the idea of unity. But their efforts, as in the case of the heathen, proved a failure.

The triumph of the Romish hierarchy was the beginning of its decay. The human mind had been carried to an extreme, and a reaction must ensue. This was witnessed in the Reformation of Luther. That energy, which had held the world in check, and by its all embracing grasp, subjected every opposing agency, seemed to stop of a sudden, and with a struggle, that shook every department of human activity, took an opposite direction. The love for the universal threatened to become an obsolete idea. Its corruptions, as it appeared in the hierarchy of Rome, became a stench in the nostrils of the world. The old passed away, and everything became new. As the church previously had been the centre of attraction, so now the individual became an object of wide-spread interest. Individual improvement and rights swayed in the contentions of the times. The new current in human affairs, moved forward, bearing down all opposition, sparing nothing, though sanctified by antiquity, and covered over with the most deeply interesting associations. The deluge of northern barbarians in their sanguinary course over the fields of ancient civilization, plundering, and defacing with a barbaric indifference every remain of a former state of things,

can scarcely be compared with the new influence, which the Reformation brought to bear on modern civilization. The mind of man freed from religious tyranny sought, in accordance with the laws of its own being, to realize this freedom in other departments of activity. Freed as it respects its relation to God, it could not long remain, on the score of mere consistency, a slave to man. This subjective tendency then has been the ruling power in history since the sixteenth century, and has to a greater or less extent, rendered every other interest, the church, the state, and cultivation in general, subject to its sway. Within the range of this new era, America, with its peculiar modification of life, stands forth in intimate connection with this newly established-world-influence.

Our intellectual life partakes as largely of the modern spirit, as our activity under any other aspect. In this country knowledge has doubtless increased, but mainly under the influence of the subjective influence already referred to. Every branch of knowledge has received attention, and the progress in what are called the sciences, for so youthful a country, is great indeed. There is, however, as great a want of unity in our intellectual pursuits, as there is in our political or religious existence. Sciences are studied as something separate and independent of each other, and no attempt is made to refer them to some central point, around which they are to revolve, and where they may be seen in their proper relation to each other. Different departments of knowledge are made to embrace separate spheres of existence, as if all existence did not form a whole, that cannot be separated without violence. Science and revelation are still made to oppose each other as well as elsewhere. This state of things has its cause in our European origin. In ancient times when other influences were operative, it was the aim of philosophers to bring all knowledge into a circle,—to harmonize its apparently jarring interests. This was the office of philosophy as something distinct from science, or the investigation of a particular branch of knowledge. Cicero calls it the parent of all the sciences.¹ In the speculations of Plato, different branches of knowledge are organized into a most beautiful system, all springing from a central unity. His system has always been admired for its comprehensiveness and compactness. He ruled in the in-

¹ Neque enim te fugit, omnium laudatarum artium procreatricem quandam, et quasi parentem, eam, quam philosophiam Graeci vocant, ab hominibus decussimis judicari.—*DE ORATORE.*

tellectual world, with the highest authority, for at least a thousand years, and among the most various and opposing systems, as it were by the magic of his name maintained his sway. From the ninth century, his scholar Aristotle, succeeded him in influence, whose system aims at a similar authority over the domain of knowledge, though it has been supposed to possess less unity. These attempts at philosophizing were to a great extent failures, which is no more than what might be anticipated under the circumstances. To have presented an organic system of knowledge, would have been as impossible, as to have written a perfect Geography of the world, before the discovery of America by Columbus. The subject-matter of knowledge had not as yet been traversed. There were continents that had not as yet been discovered. Revelation had not been made known, or it shone with but a glimmering light. But the object kept in view was right and proper. It is the aim of knowledge to reflect the universe around in the totality of its parts; the mind cannot rest satisfied, until it can see ideally the great world spread out before it; it is therefore unjust to condemn the ancient schools without a limitation. If they were inferior to us in details, they were superior to us in a more important respect. Under the subjective tendency of modern times, philosophy, or this general science, began to lose its credit more and more. In the Baconian system, there seems to be no room left for it at all. Indeed in his two celebrated tracts upon philosophy, it is his object to explode it altogether, and to substitute in its place, in the natural sciences at least, his method of induction. He discards all *a priori* reasoning as fallacious, and fruitful in errors. Under the influence of Locke, all intuitive notions or ideas are attempted to be forever banished from the sphere of science. The weight of these two names has been sufficient, to make their numerous disciples heartily doubt, whether there is such a thing as philosophy in the ancient sense of the term. By the great mass of English and American minds it is stoutly resisted. Its aid or assistance in the pursuit of knowledge, is entirely rejected. It is supposed to be the parent of all mental aberrations, and the errors of the ancient schools are all laid to its charge. In this country knowledge has increased, but as a general thing, under the influence of this foreign tendency. *It is here as elsewhere fragmentary, and to a great extent divorced from religion, where it should find its centre. It is successfully used for the defence of error, and is often prostituted to the vilest purposes.

Our political life, for which we are often disposed to claim the credit of originality, is also intimately connected with influences, that were at work in Europe previous to our existence.

After the downfall of the empires of antiquity, civil power became an object of secondary importance in the world. Another interest, the Church of Christ, enlisted the affections of men. After the Roman Empire there arose no political power, worthy of being compared with it. The reign of Charlemagne was partial; it extended over but a part of the world, and at his death crumbled into ruins. It was succeeded by the Germanic Empire with youthful freshness under Otho. But during the thousand years of its duration, it had never arrived at any degree of compactness, and like its predecessor, was limited in its rule. Under Gregory VII, and Innocent III, it was subject to the spiritual power. In the case of all these struggles after political centralization, there was little else, but an aping after the empires of antiquity, a struggle after something, which was passing away. Under these circumstances the Reformation commenced its action upon the State. Government received a modification from the new tendency called forth in the religious world. It received a new aim, and began to be animated with a new life. Instead of being designed as an instrument for selfish purposes, for external grandeur and effect, it was directed, as in the case of religion, to the individual, and was required to elevate him in his social position.

In England more than in any other country, Politics was more evidently modified by the principles of the Reformation. The reformation of the church in this country was of a two-fold character. It was on the one hand conservative; it sought to accommodate the new form of faith to the established order of things. Henry VIII was willing to reform the English Church, provided it could be extricated from the power of the Roman See; further than this, he made little account of the principles of Luther. The views of Queen Elizabeth were of a similar character in regard to the reformation of the church. This state of things served to awaken on the other hand a more radical reformation, among the lower classes, who clamorously advocated not only the doctrines of Calvin, but also his system of church Government, which is the most perfect form of republicanism. Corresponding to these religious movements, we find reflected upon the outward world, similar political movements. It is sometimes thought that the rise of liberal principles in England during the seventeenth century, was owing to Puritan influence entirely, whilst their opponents were the advocates of despotism, and tyranny. Such a view, however, does injustice to history, as well as to the facts in the case. The Revolution of 1649 was doubtless occasioned by the leaven of Puritanism,

and Cromwell, who was at the head of it, stands in an inseparable historical connection with its religious tendency. But the Restoration under William, Prince of Orange, a born republican, with its accompanying blessings to England, was mainly owing to the enemies of Cromwell and his Puritan allies.

In France the republican tendencies of the Reformation, began to be manifested at an early period. But in this country, there were individuals at the helm of power, who could descry their influence at a distance, and make provisions to keep them there. With the politicians of France, Calvinism was synonymous with the overthrow of despotic power. They were consequently willing to bear upon their national character the disgrace of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the slaughter of St. Bartholomew's night, with their attending horrors, rather than to allow the silent operation of principles, which they felt must eventually overthrow their authority. But though France by dint of persecutions, the most hateful in the annals of time, succeeded in warding off to a certain extent the progress of religious, and with it civil freedom, she was obliged to yield at length to that power, which was moulding the destinies of the world. The progress of liberal principles had been checked, but not repressed. They came at length, but with what unexampled violence did they seize the nation! The French Revolution was the fruit of bigotry and intolerance. It came later than the English Revolution; it was also more violent, because the internal forces had been gathering for a longer period.

A similar improvement in the political condition of other nations in Europe might be noticed. But no where had the spirit of the age an opportunity to run its course in that part of the world. The genius of its ancient superstition and tyranny still lingered around its massive ruins, and awed the hand of the innovator, as he attempted to erect a structure after the modern style. Europe, covered over with the deeply interesting associations of the past, was not an arena for the display of a new world-historical power. It were a more easy matter to arouse ancient Babylon from the tomb of Empires, or cause Palmyra to smile again in her lonely desert, than to expect that she, crowded with memories of her ancient splendor, should have again resumed a youthful activity, and become the centre of a new civilization. It was but the other day that she disappointed the high-wrought expectations of many in this country, and now she bids fair to run through her cycle,—only to give room to more youthful nations to solve the problem of the world's destiny. For the exhibition of a new phasis of humanity, it seemed nec-

essary that some more congenial spot should be obtained. For this purpose America was discovered, and just about the time, when the spirit of the Reformation awoke.

Every where in this country progress in the political relations of man may be discerned,—improvements far in advance of the old world; yet every where the spirit now so active in Europe looks forth. Whilst we have our individual rights secured to us in an eminent degree, a onesided individualism is fearfully at work in both sections of the country. A process of disintegration is going on, that requires our united energies to resist. Division and distraction are the order of the day. Unity has so few attractions, that the constitution of our country, which asks but little sacrifice from the individual, meets with no approbation from some. The dangers to our country from the direction referred to, were pointed out by the acute De Tocqueville in his work on Democracy in America a few years ago, and subsequent experience has proved his observations to be just. During the political tempest through which the country has just passed, the tendency of our political life came to light. We seemed to be on the eve of returning to a complete atomic state. Still the principle of unity prevailed, showing that we have not entirely lost our regard for what is objective in politics, and giving us encouragement to believe, that our existence is not destined to result in what politicians call, a political blunder.

It is beginning to be regarded that American freedom sprung up from the germ deposited by the Pilgrim Fathers on the shores of Plymouth. This is usually the burden of speeches delivered at new England dinners. We meet with individuals in all parts of the Union, who speak of "our Pilgrim Fathers," though they have not a drop of Pilgrim blood coursing their veins; so that we might be led to suppose, that the heterogeneous population of this country, German, Irish, French, and Anti Puritanic, would by and by claim paternity at their hands. We think that other parts of the Union acted equally as prominent a part in the establishment of our Institutions, and deserve to be held in equal remembrance. It is but necessary to refer to Virginia, in order to substantiate the truth of this statement. The original settlers of Virginia were of quite a different mental complexion from that of the Puritans. They were for the most Englishmen, descendents of opponents of Cromwell, and represented a distinct tendency in the progress of civil liberty. So we might refer to Maryland, which was founded under Catholic auspices, where the spirit of liberty was ripe at the outbreak of the Revolution. Pennsylvania, which was settled mainly by persons of

German descent, was among the first of the states, that sought for political regeneration. If the genius of Puritanism was favorable to freedom and republican institutions, it was only so in virtue of the general spirit of the age, which it shared in conjunction with the other provinces. In Europe the tendency of the times in every direction was in favor of progress, improvement, and a general extension of individual liberty. The Reformation, whilst it has been the source of every thing great and good during the three last centuries, is also the parent of American freedom. Its influence was not confined to the religious world, in which it commenced,—it extended over the territories of science and politics. Infidels and sceptics were carried along by the same general current, blindly submitting in politics to what they rejected in religion. On this account the fact that some of the prominent men of our early history were irreligious men; and, indeed, infidels, cannot detract from the genuine value of our political superstructure. It is a merit of Bancroft's *History of the United States*, giving it at once a national value, that he endeavors to point out the different historical and religious tendencies, that were transplanted at an early date to the soil of the different states, and which subsequently combined to fight the battles of freedom.

It is not a difficult matter to present the points of union between our religious life and that of Europe. It was the merit of the Reformation, to bring forward into prominent light, the idea of christian freedom, in which, we, perhaps, pride ourselves more than did our ancestors. The Creeds and Theology of the Reformation are our most precious legacy. Indeed such has been the power of the ruling idea in this country, that the churches have run to excess, and in many directions ignored the principle of unity, which, however, is opposed to the spirit of the Reformation. The words, unity and brotherhood, it is true, have some attraction, and some degree of power, but the thing itself is very much suspected. There is every where a desire for denominational unity, though every where it meets with serious interruption. But how far are we from being united as denominations into one universal christian church. The very idea is considered preposterous, and full of danger to our rights as citizens of the heavenly kingdom. Our political life is much better organized, than our religious life as a whole. It creates a glow of patriotism when the visitor stands in the galleries of

¹ See Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*.

the Capitol at Washington, and witnesses the nicely balanced machinery of our government,—working out the destiny of a country extending from Maine to California. He here meets the spirit of the nation standing forth in an objective form, and sees that our political life is a common one. If, however, he be of a religious cast of mind, he looks forward into futurity, and asks whether our religious existence shall ever gain some central point,—a heart which shall send out to the most distant extremities, the warm fluid of a common life. The children of this world are wiser in their generation, than the children of light.

Our historical connections and relations serve to give this country significance, and at the same time a relative value. If, as we have seen, with the germs of much that is good in the past, we have received much that is evil at the same time, America is not of yesterday, the growth of a night. It is not, as it is often represented the undutiful child, that never learned the first commandment with promise. So far as she has honored and obeyed her parent, she may expect that her days shall be long in the land which God has given her. The perpetuity of our Institutions is not so much dependent upon the abstract principles upon which they are based, or the measures, that are taken to uphold them, as their connection with the God of history, who is the only living and true God. The English Commonwealth after existing a brief summer-day fell, because it was the mock-creation of man; the first French Republic had a much briefer day, because it had a much more slender historical basis to stand upon. With all human organizations, as with individuals, obedience is the precursor of prosperity. The law is our school-master to bring us to Christ.

If to our historical advantages, we add the spirit of a chastened progress, our life will assume more and more an absolute value. The progress referred to, however, is not such a one as that in which the times have been rapidly carrying us. Freedom, civil and religious rights, individual progress are objects that may always engross our warmest affections; but what we most need at the present day is progress in the direction of unity. The precious inheritance lies at our doors, but it needs to be cultivated; it is still in a chaotic state, it needs to be protected, to be adorned, to bear the impress of an owner, before it can be called our property. The gold from the distant mines is ours; to become current it must pass through the mint, and bear a common image and superscription. No country upon earth, perhaps, possesses greater natural advantages than ours. Its location with reference to the old world is peculiar. With Eu-

rope and Africa on the east, and since the improvements in navigation, our next door neighbors ; with Asia, the residence of ancient civilization on the west, our country would seem to be destined to occupy the centre-point of civilization, and to a fervid imagination, be the last link of influences in bringing about the glory of the latter-day, when the human race shall have attained its unity and consummation. Yet all the advantages of climate, soil, and geographical position are dependent upon the spirit, which is to rule in our people. Nature is entirely at the mercy of spirit. When the human world degenerates, the outward world becomes a wilderness and seems to sympathize with the moral desolation. To make the desert and the solitary place glad, and the desert to blossom as the rose, every thing depends upon the purification of our religious life. Its variegated tints, that now charm us so much by their brilliancy of color, must again be united to give us a pure light, which after all is most wholesome. Then knowledge and revelation will be reconciled, and philosophy become the hand-maiden of religion. Then politics and government will be purified, and the state become the servant of Christ ; the Church, the Lamb's Bride, will have kings for her nursing fathers, and queens for her nursing mothers : and they shall bow down to her with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of her feet. Isaiah 49 : 23.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. A.

CUR DEUS HOMO?

"It is oftentimes considered the chief purpose of Christ's Incarnation," says Trench (*Huls. Lect.* p. 218,) "that it made his death possible, that it provided him a body in which to do that which merely as God he could not do namely to suffer and to die; while some of the profoundest teachers of the past, so far from contemplating the Incarnation in this light, have rather affirmed that the Son of God would equally have taken man's nature, though of course under very different conditions, even if he had not fallen—that it lay in the everlasting purposes of God, quite irrespective of the fall, that the stem and the stalk of humanity should at length bear its perfect flower in Him, who should thus at once be its root and crown." This passage we have quoted before, in our notice of the work from which it is taken, as one of significant interest in relation to the great subject to which it refers.

In a later article we have called attention to a more full and formal presentation of the same view by Professor Liebner of Germany, who makes it in fact the foundation thought of his recent work on Christology. The view is adopted also by Dörner, and has called forth as we have seen the direct approbation of Schöberlein, in an able recension of Liebner's work published in Reuter's Repertorium. Liebner himself has appeared again, as we have also seen, in the same Journal, in opposition to Dr. Thomasius, a distinguished Lutheran divine, who it seems has entered the lists with him on the opposite side. This may serve to show the interest which is taken in the question here brought into debate, and how intimately related it is felt to be to the very heart of theology at the present time.

We find now a new writer on the field, Dr. Julius Müller, the author of the widely celebrated treatise on Sin. His mere name is sufficient of course to command attention and respect. He is not a man to take up any subject lightly, and what he writes is sure to carry with it the weight both of extensive learning and profound thought. This credit is well sustained by his dissertation on the subject before us, in two articles contained in Schneider's *Deutsche Zeitschrift* for October 1850, under the title: "The Question examined, Whether the Son of God would have become man, if the human race had continued without sin." The occasion of the discussion is in large part at least the work of Professor Liebner. It is not however a review of this in any strict sense, but addresses itself to the inquiry with

which it is occupied in a general way. The investigation is exceedingly calm, but at the same time exceedingly searching and deep, and the conclusion reached by it is a full negative answer to the question that forms its theme. The author allows a large merit to Liebner's work, and considers it an important contribution to theological science, especially in its view of the deep and difficult doctrine of the Trinity; but he rejects as unsound and unsafe the thought on which it rests throughout, that the necessity of the Incarnation lies primarily not in the fall of man but in his creation. Liebner of course, as we have before seen, does not call in question the soteriological design of the mystery, its relation to sin as the only possible means of redemption and salvation; he simply maintains, that this is not to be viewed as the exclusive or primary reason of the mystery, that there was a necessity for it on the contrary back of this, and of a far broader and deeper nature, in the original idea of humanity itself, in virtue of which only it was possible for the special need created by the fall to find its remedy and cure here under any such supernatural form. But Müller refuses to acknowledge any necessity for the Incarnation, beyond the existence of sin and the idea of redemption. The soteriological interest forms in his view the ultimate and whole reason of the stupendous mystery; so that if the first Adam had not fallen, there would have been no second Adam to take his place, if sin had not entered into the world the Son of God would never have assumed human flesh.

Some traces of the other view, according to Müller, are to be met with in the Patristic Period, particularly in the writings of Irenaeus; but it is among the Schoolmen of the middle ages that it first comes distinctly and formally into view. Anselm of Canterbury, in his celebrated tract, *Cur Deus Homo?* excludes it, by referring the Incarnation wholly to the necessity of an atonement for sin; and Thomas Aquinas rests in the same conclusion, as most in harmony with the authority of the Scriptures, although he seems occasionally to look a different way, and has been quoted in fact by some as the patron of the other opinion. On the other hand a certain abbot Rupert, a theologian of decidedly biblical rather than scholastic turn, appears in the 12th century as the open advocate of the view, setting it in what he conceives to be necessary connection with Augustine's theory of predestination. After his time, a number of the schoolmen are found answering the question, *Cur Deus homo?* in the same general way; as for instance Alexander Hales, John Duns Scotus, and his school. "With this last his Pelagianizing anthro-

pology may have come here somewhat into play, inclining him to detract from the weight of sin as a determining influence on God's counsels; but the immediate reason he urges in favor of the view is, that the happiness and glory to which Christ's soul has been predestinated is a Divine purpose which in the order of dignity goes before the purpose of salvation towards other souls, on which account the Incarnation, as being the necessary condition of its realization, cannot in the order of God's purposes depend on the fall of man absolutely as its cause. Were this the case, it would seem to follow that Christ must be regarded as a *bonum occasionatum*, something which Duns Scotus takes to be wholly derogatory to the proper glory of his nature." We find the same view earnestly maintained again by the celebrated John Wessel, and still also under the same general regard to the dignity of Christ's person, as infinitely transcending even in his human nature the worth of all human beings besides.

With the Reformers of the 16th century the sense of sin was so active, and along with this the idea of redemption so prominent and strong, that the question, whether the Son of God would not have assumed flesh even if man had never fallen, may be said to have had no power even to engage their serious attention. At all events they could have for it but one answer. The mystery of the Incarnation depends for them on the tragedy of Sin. If pressed with the difficulty of upholding the absolute sovereignty of God's decree they are ready in favor of this view to take refuge even in supralapsarianism, and to include the fall itself in the decree as the condition of redemption. So Calvin, as we all know, without any sort of qualification or reserve. But Luther when necessary looked at the matter in the same light. Even in his Larger Catechism he says: "*Ob id ipsum nos creavit Deus, ut nos redimeret*," God created man in order to his redemption—a proposition which implies that the act of creation must have carried in it a provision for that which makes redemption necessary, in other words must have involved the necessity of sin. A public representative indeed of the other view of the necessity of the Incarnation, comes before us in this age in the person of the Lutheran Osiander. But this advocacy stood connected with what was considered an unsound theology on the subject of justification, which caused it of course to have more weight against the view in question than in its favor. The case was made still worse for it, by its gaining the approbation of Faustus Socinus; though with him again the reason for receiving it lay in a particular peculiarity of his own system which the hypothesis happened to fit, rather than in the older

theological speculation. "Thus it happened," says the writer before us, "that a theological opinion which had been considered in the middle ages open for free discussion in the schools," fell everywhere with the older Protestant theology into the reproach of heterodoxy. The orthodox divines of the Lutheran confession, so far as they touch the question, declare themselves with one voice against it. Still this has not prevented the later theology from looking favorably on a view, which is felt to be recommended especially by the consideration, that the highest act of Divine love, bringing with it the greatest exaltation of man, cannot be regarded as dependent upon man's wilful self-perversion, and so on something accidental, but must rest on the original pure idea of the creation in the Divine mind, or in other words on the *essential relation between God and man*."

The investigation here in hand has to do with its subject, only as presented on the ground of the true Bible doctrine of a personal God. Pantheistic systems, which resolve the activity of God's love into a metaphysical process of absolute self-consciousness, made complete at last through the speculative thinking of the human spirit, have also appropriated to themselves the thought now in question; but their meaning is simply, that man is formed by his nature to become divine or theanthropic, in which view the entire history of the race is to be regarded as a so called eternal incarnation of the Deity. All such logico-metaphysical blasphemy is here left entirely out of sight. Supposing the Incarnation to be necessary even for a normal development of our human life, it is regarded as flowing only from an *ethical* principle or ground, from an act of the personal God; in the case of which any *necessity* it may have must rest wholly on the freedom of the Divine will, the disposition of God's love to reveal itself under such form.—So also no regard is had to those theories of an original necessity for the Incarnation, which shrink not from making it to be the completion of God himself, the higher unity, as they say, in which the contradiction of the pretended abstractions, Deity and Humanity, is brought to an end (*aufgehoben*). Such a view gives the mystery indeed the character of absolute necessity, not for man only but also for God; but it completely destroys in doing so the true idea of the absolute, and gives us under the name of an eternal Divine incarna-

¹ So Bonaventura speaking of the two different theories says: "Quis autem horum (modorum) alteri praeponendus sit difficile est videre pro eo, quod uterque modus catholicus est et a viris catholicis sustinetur."

tion the absurdity of an *absolute coming to pass*. This excludes too the conception that the Son of God or the Logos became flesh; the assumption is that *God became flesh*; an idea which implies a rejection of the christian doctrine of the Trinity, and resolves the whole being of God into a process. Christian science should be on its guard thus against even the sound of anything like an agreement with such a view; a caution, Müller thinks, which has not been sufficiently observed in certain quarters of the later German theology, where a disposition has been shown to transplant not merely the sound but the actual substance of the false idea in question to the historical field of the Bible. The idea of course has the whole voice and spirit of the New Testament against it; while it inevitably subverts besides the conception of God and that of the creature both at once. "The being of God would in this view fall fully into the course of time; up to a certain point in time he could not have been true and perfect God; and so could not be this either after such date; for an absolute which has come to pass is no less a contradiction, than one eternally coming to pass. Since moreover there could be no incarnation of the Logos without created existence, it would follow that God needed the world in order that he might truly be God; he creates it accordingly, to bring himself into full reality—that is, he does not create it at all, for the idea of creation implies essentially freedom over against the world, which is here supposed to be wanting; in the world, which all sound theism owns to be the creature of God, he must at the same time see the *condition of himself*, and Angelus Silesius would be right with his impiously bold word:

Gott ist soviel an mir, wie mir an ihm gelegen;
Ich helf sein Wesen ihm, er hilft mir meines hegen.

Propositions such as the necessity of God's becoming man to complete his own nature, and the consequences that flow from it, may have some intelligible meaning on the platform of pantheism; but when transplanted to theistic ground they lose all sense and force, and deceive with a mere show of depth that comes only of the dim uncertain twilight in which they involve the mind. If they cannot satisfy it they at least put it into a state of confusion, and that itself is for many a sort of inward satisfaction."

The question then regards properly no conception of this kind, as the ground of the necessity for the Incarnation; but supposes the case to be, that such necessity is referred only to the *human*

side of the transaction ; in the sense namely, that it is *man* only who could not truly fulfil his own idea, the sense of his own nature, without the entrance of the Logos in a real way into the organism of his life.

Here comes into consideration the posture of Schleiermacher's theology with regard to the point in hand. Thomasius makes this the source in fact of the modern form of the proposition, that the Son of God would have become incarnate even if man had not sinned. But Müller shows very clearly that it has no root in Schleiermacher's theory whatever. According to this theory, Christ is the completion of human nature, the second stage of man's creation as distinguished from the first in Adam (*Glaubenslehre* §. 89.). The first creation is imperfect, through a want of full harmony in the nature of man between his conscience and will, the consciousness of God not being strong enough to give the spirit its proper supremacy over the flesh ; in Christ first this consciousness with its corresponding power appears in full force ; and from him, through the action of faith directed towards him by his people, it is brought to extend itself to the race generally, completing thus the original sense of our human life, and setting it free from its previous imperfection. Creation and redemption here are only different parts of one work. In this view, it is plain, that there is no room for the question, whether the Incarnation would have been necessary if man had not sinned. For what the system takes for sin is in truth a mere natural defect in the first form of man's being itself, which from the first looks forward to the higher consciousness of Christ as its own needful complement and end ; and this itself must be regarded of course then as the only normal order which the case allows. Or if it should be imagined that there might have been, according to the theory, such a progress of the first imperfect life of the race as would not have been attended with that inward contradiction and disturbance which we now experience under the notion of sin, it is easy to see that in such case there could be no room for the introduction of a higher order of existence in a single personal Christ as the means of redemption for others. In every view clearly, the system of Schleiermacher implies that the mystery of the incarnation is conditioned by the imperfection of the world as it now stands, and knows no ground beyond this or aside from this on which to speak of it as necessary.

We come thus to Müller's second article, with the question disentangled from all false connections, and reduced to its proper theistic and truly christian form. Admitting the existence of a

personal holy God, the perfect freeness of his acts, the original sufficiency of the first creation, the awful reality of the fall as something made necessary only through man's will, and the need of a real redemption by Christ's death, the thesis under consideration still asserts, that the mystery of the incarnation does not depend absolutely on this abnormal course of things, but would have had place also on the supposition of a normal or sinless development of man's life. It is allowed that the entrance of sin rendered it necessary for the mystery to take the special soteriological character under which it now appears; but the idea is, that back of this particular need there lay a broader and deeper necessity for it in the original creation of man's nature itself, which would have required it to make this in full what it was designed to be even if it had remained true to its first state. This is the thought to be examined and tried.

The older advocates of the opinion endeavored to rest it on direct scriptural proof. Its modern friends however see and acknowledge, that the Bible everywhere refers the fact of the incarnation to sin and the necessity of redemption. In other words it proceeds throughout on the simply soteriological theory, without any distinct regard to the other. It is not necessary to quote particular texts in proof of this. They meet us on all sides; while only three or four, such as 1 Cor. xv: 45-47, Eph. i: 21-23, Col. ii: 10, 1 Peter iii: 22, and as more plausible than all the rest Col. i: 16-17, are made to look by circuitous and doubtful interpretation the other way. But why, it is asked, may we not admit along with this direct biblical view, another also of more comprehensive character, growing forth from the power of legitimate and necessary speculation exercised on the vast scheme of christian truth as a whole? Thus related the two theories do not exclude each other. Rather the biblical representation is to be taken simply as a determinate phase of the truth, which is embraced in the other more general construction. The first proceeds analytically, planting itself on the fact of man's state as it now is; the other moves synthetically, in just the opposite direction. The last has to do with the general or universal substance of the relation in question; while the Bible, answerable to the actual condition of the world, brings into view a *specific mode and form* of its realization, namely the Word made flesh in order to the exhaustion of man's curse by suffering and death.

But this imagination of the possible harmony of the two theories, according to our author, is attended with great difficulties. Take first, for instance, that which starts from the *need of re-*

demption. The theory involves not merely single biblical texts, but the whole view that is taken of Christ's person, and of its relations to the world both before and since. "Our earthly human life as it now stands is directly and unavoidably subject to suffering; the soteriological view of the incarnation affirms of course that the entrance of the Son of God into this whole form of existence presupposes sin, and by it alone becomes intelligible. The same theory presses the consideration moreover, that in assuming flesh the Logos has been born as a member of the Jewish nation, and in subjection to its law, while the whole Israelitish economy resulted certainly from the fact of the fall. Only in view of sin again, it is urged, does it become intelligible why the incarnation took not place at the beginning of man's history, but at a later time; sin must first ripen, and humanity show what it was able to do of itself after the fall, before the Son of God could appear as the author of redemption and the dispenser of a higher life. And who can doubt, the soteriological theory is ready to add, but that all this is according to the sense of the Apostles, and particularly of that one among them, who alone has left us in his writings the outline of a general view of the world with Christ for its centre?" The mode too in which we are brought to participate in Christ's life, is such as to involve in its very nature the supposition of sin. Not only is this the case with repentance, but also with faith in the sense of Paul and John. Suppose no opposition between the natural and spiritual, the world of sense and the invisible world, in man's soul, and what room would there be for the idea of faith, as the power that breaks through the one to embrace the other? What room would there be for the conception of that agency of the Holy Ghost, which is represented to be now the medium of Christ's life and work in the world since his return to the Father? But how can we think of any such opposition between the two worlds in question, the soteriological theory asks, without the entrance of the disturbing power of sin into the process of man's life?

As regards the *work* of Christ again, the soteriological view will not consent of course to hold itself simply to the idea of the priestly office; as though the prophetic and kingly offices were to be properly cared for, as some have pretended, only by the other theory. It finds full scope for both these last in its conception of the kingdom of God, which is based on the fact of the fall and destined to end as a new creation in the glories of the resurrection. The three offices are in truth subordinated throughout to the idea of *redemption*.

"Thus it is that the theory which finds the cause of the incarnation in sin and the need of salvation, spreads itself out over the entire compass of the fact as it appears in history, over Christ's person and work, beginning and end, mode of revelation time, national sphere, all going before as preparation and all following after as consequence; no room is left anywhere for any other principle to appropriate to itself any part or portion of the fact; the actual incarnation is taken up by its explanatory account at all points, so as completely to thrust aside that other theory of an original general necessity for it as a purely vague and empty abstraction."

The same want of inward agreement between the two views will be felt, if we reverse the order of consideration and start with the opposite principle, that namely which places the christological necessity back of sin in the general nature of man.

The idea is, that if the development of humanity had gone forward in a perfectly normal and sinless way the Logos would still have become flesh. But for what end? Not for show merely, or to please the imagination. It must be thought of under an ethical view, as Liebner himself is careful to allow; it must be regarded as an act of *love* on the part of God. To whom? Of course to the human race. What would it communicate then; what want of the race would it propose to supply?

Here the ground is taken, that the race could have no true unity or wholeness without the God-man, that if its parts are not to fall asunder atomistically it must have a *personal head*, in whom the human nature is joined with the divine. This cannot mean merely, that Christ is appointed for all mankind as their ruler, and all mankind for him to submit to his government, that they belong of right to him and he to them; for so much the soteriological view itself allows, which is taken to fall short of the principle here in hand. Christ's headship over the race then must be understood of an *actual relation* holding between it and himself; as the New Testament also in truth refers the sense of *κεφαλὴ* only to a relation of this sort. Thus then a predicate, which is used of Jesus Christ commonly in his relation to the *Church*, is here transferred to the relation he bears to mankind in general, an application it never has in the Scriptures. But what does it signify in the first relation? Nothing less, certainly, than that he is joined in real life union with his Church, so as to be its ruling and actuating principle, filling it with his presence, and using it as the organ of his will, by the power of the Holy Ghost. But now extend this conception to the race as

a whole, and what becomes of the reference of the incarnation in any view to the idea of sin? Humanity then, sin or no sin, as being already in union with the divine-human life, needs no redemption. It has by this real relation all that it requires, and it becomes idle indeed to speak of sin as in any sense a fall from God; since in the midst of it all the race still stands, through its actual head, in full fellowship with God, and in full possession also of eternal life. What room can there be in such circumstances for the idea of redemption, or for making it in any way the object of the incarnation?

Each of the views in question then, it appears, goes actually to exclude the other. They refuse to stand together. It follows, that to maintain itself at all the idealistic theory, which pretends to resolve the mystery into a deeper general ground back of the soteriological view, must quit this abstract position, and come forward as the only sufficient key for the explanation of the whole fact.

In this case however one feature of it at least must still be excepted, the Saviour's *death upon the cross*. Not to refer this wholly to sin, would be to contradict plainly the whole sense of the Scriptures. But it is not easy to uphold the propitiatory signification of this death, if we are to retain steadily the thought that the God-man is the real head of the whole human race. It seems the most ready course to say, that the intervention of sin made it necessary for the head of the race to appear under such a form as should include, in addition to the requirements of the idea under its normal character, the provision of an atonement for the removal of the guilt belonging to men by means of suffering and death. But to say nothing of the isolated position the atonement is thus made to take in the general revelation of Christ, the force of it as a real condition of reconciliation with God cannot stand, where it is firmly held that Christ is the actual head of all mankind, and so still less of course the necessity of the incarnation for any such end. The death of the Son of God then must be taken as having a declarative value only, suited to assure men that their original and essential relation to their ever living head remains good notwithstanding their sense of guilt. Such a declaration might have been given by word alone; but it is rendered more expressive through the real symbol thus exhibited in the transaction of the cross. How every such view tends to sink the central mystery of faith into the form of a mere accommodation to human fancy and conceit, stripping it of all objective necessity and so of all real inward power, it is not necessary here to prove. It falls in truth into

the sphere of certain well known rationalistic theories, which are fairly exploded on the field of true theology.

Will it be said, to avoid this difficulty, that the idea of Christ's natural headship of the race anticipates and presumes of course a real appropriation of his atonement, on the part of men, by repentance and faith, and so cannot be regarded as having force till this condition is at hand? But if the thought in such form is not to lose itself in the mere conception of Christ's destination for the race at large, which belongs to the other theory, it must imply evidently the restoration of all men to communion with God as the metaphysically necessary end of all human development, and so along with this the overthrow in full of the ideas of freedom, accountability, guilt, punishment and pardon; and what becomes then of the real appropriation of the atonement through repentance and faith?

Or may it be supposed perhaps, that a part of mankind by its wilful resistance to the attraction of the head sunders itself from the body that belongs to it? So Liebner would seem to think, when he speaks of the loss of the wicked as "compensated" by the head, in which is realized the full idea of humanity. But this in one view is plainly to fall back into the scriptural thought, that Christ is the head of the *Church*; for the system of humanity as such is made to give way in favor of the body of the redeemed, to which only, and not to the race at large, the term *σῶμα* is applied in the New Testament. In this way the idealistic account of the incarnation would yield in truth to the soteriological. In another view however one cannot see, why the supposed capacity of Christ to compensate for the loss of a *part* of the race, should not be sufficient also to compensate if need be for the *whole*—a result certainly as anti-soteriological as possible. Then the last sense of his revelation, would be not his love towards actually existing men, but the perfect realization of the full idea of humanity in himself! But what becomes then of the *ethical* motive already acknowledged, as lying at the ground of the mystery? The thought besides dialectically destroys itself; for a head in which the whole idea of the body is already realized, so that it can by itself make good any deficiency in this whether partial or total, is by such character raised above the relativity that belongs to the very conception of the head.

Paul found all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge in Jesus Christ *crucified*. If the theory before us is to be more than an empty abstraction, as before said, it must be able, aside from this idea of the cross, to explain the other aspects and connections of the historical incarnation, as related to the world both

before and since. Can it do this? Liebner seems to think so; for on the ground that the idea of humanity is supposed absolutely to require a perfect realization in one central individual, free from all the oneness that must attach to other individuals as such, he bases the conclusion that mankind *in any case*, that is even without sin, could be righteous before God only by faith in Christ, their divine human head. "But now when Liebner himself expressly says at the same time, that this absolutely universal individual cannot belong originally to humanity, but must proceed from a higher sphere, how shall we understand it in the first place that the race should be found from the start, not by its own apostasy from God but by God's creative act, in a condition of perfect inability to meet the Divine requirement, without the implantation of a new principle higher than the nature of humanity as such? How again is the consequence to be avoided, that God in the first act of creation purposely made the world bad, in order to make it better in the second? And if we attend to it, this unavoidable insufficiency of all human individuals aside from the God-man as their universal centre, this want of righteousness in virtue of which they *cannot* be the objects of the Divine complacency, rests on no other ground than this, that as abstractions of the true ideal unity which is reached in Christ they are of course onesided and partial representations only of the real generic conception, and so necessarily inadequate examples of humanity. This itself then unfits us to stand before God in our natural state, that we are only *individuals* in the common metaphysical sense of the term! We have here a questionable mixing of the ethical and the metaphysical, from which it is only a step to the error current among the disciples of the Nature-philosophy of Schelling, that individuality is itself the principle of evil, the original fall from the absolute or God."

All goes indeed to subvert the very idea of sin. For if the abstract singleness of the human person taken by itself is itself evil, since the whole creation besides looks to this as its end, it follows that evil is identical with the conception of a finite creation; or rather in place of a creation the ground of relative existence is made, to be, as in the old Gnostic systems, a falling away from God; whereby at last the ethical force of sin is wholly swallowed up in theosophico-metaphysical dreams. Or without this, if it be assumed in any view that the world as it came originally from God could not please him, how must the idea of sin suffer and along with it the whole view of salvation! It can hardly be taken at best to signify more than an aggravation of

defects previously inherent in the creature as such. The relation between normal and abnormal becomes one of difference, not in principle, but only in degree. How easily thus may the sense of our own sin mingle itself with the sentiment of mere natural insufficiency before God, and in this lose itself altogether! Such is the mischief always of trying to fix ethical predicates on metaphysical relations which are independent of will and freedom, with the view of thus transforming them into an ethical character; the transformation strikes unavoidably the other way, the ethical notions are lost in the simply metaphysical.

The origin of Liebner's confusion here is carried back by our critic to a metaphysical thought, which has captivated others also too far, he thinks, on the same ground; this namely, that the relation of *genus* and *individual*, and the postulate from it of one representing in metaphysical sense the life of the whole, is made the point of departure for the speculative construction of the christology. The thought, in the opinion of Müller, is only a delusive phantom, with associations and tendencies besides that may well cause it to be regarded with distrust. The adequate actualization of humanity in the person of the Son of Man, did not require that he should include in himself all particular talents and properties of the race, any more than it required that he should enter into all human relations and connections. His life was revealed under natural limitations, as of sex, nationality, family, &c. True, these particularities, essential to the truth of his human nature, were at the same time surmounted and as it were set aside by the greatness of his vocation and spirit. But this is something very different from the supposed concentration metaphysically of all the constituents of the total race in him, as the central individual and microcosm of humanity.

But now taking the thought in its true sense, that the moral idea which humanity carries in itself requires its adequate realization in the form of individual life, how will it bear on the proposition, that the Son of God would have become incarnate if there had been no sin? The thought itself contains nothing that looks to the realization of this ideal only in one single individual. Rather it requires it of all; for not to strive after it would be a positive falling away from morality, and the imagination of an endless striving that can never reach the end, a vain *progressus in infinitum*, is a contradiction that destroys itself. It lies however in the very nature of the *moral idea*, that the *nîsus* in question should be directed towards the *whole* realiza-

tion of this idea if it is to have place in the mind at all ; for the idea is based on man's relation to God, and is for this reason superior to all conditions and circumstances besides. Artistic, scientific, political ideals have quite another character. Their realization calls everywhere for a division of work into different spheres ; even the most prominent minds here are the bearers and organs only of some distinct part of the idea. So the greatest musical genius may have no sense whatever for works of sculpture and painting, or the reverse. But in the realization of the *moral* idea, there is no room to speak of any such division of tasks in the service of the whole. The aim must be all or nothing. The object of redemption accordingly, now that sin has turned the race aside from its original destination, is to bring to pass the adequate realization of this idea in all that are gathered by it into the kingdom of God. But suppose sin had not occurred ; then the idea must have actualized itself to the full in all human individuals—which is indeed implied also by the hypothesis of a normal development ; and thus the thought before us by no means leads to the necessity of the incarnation for the realization required.

New difficulties in the way of the theory under consideration come into view, when we take into account the existence of other created intelligences besides men, either angels or the inhabitants of other planets. " If it lies in the conception of created personality universally, that its complete destiny can be reached only through the real union of the Logos with its nature, we must assume, (against Heb. ii : 16 indeed,) that such a mystery has had place also in favor of the angels. But it belongs to the very idea of a true incarnation that the Logos enters as subject into the process of an individual human life throughout ; and if he is not to lose his personal unity in thus going out of himself this can have place only in one individual. United with two or more, he would not be truly in any with his actual self, but the union must be thought of merely as a sort of prophetic inspiration—the Logos simply working upon the created consciousness, without identifying himself with it and so without personal conjunction. Or else we must imagine a succession of personal unions—like the Hindoo avatars of Vishnu for instance, in which the deity takes the forms of different creatures and drops them again one after another. But this conception also plainly destroys the truth of the incarnation ; for to this the permanence of the union is indispensable, since the truth of man's being implies continued existence. Pantheistic systems indeed, if they admit the hypothesis of other orders of personal beings

beside men, can easily enough extend to them *their* idea of the incarnation, the process by which God takes form in the world ; this however, just because they allow no real incarnation in the christian sense, as a free act of love on the part of the Son, emptying himself of his glory for the purpose, but turn this thought into a vague shallow generality that has no power to bring man an inch nearer to the living God. Christian knowledge owns only one incarnation of the Logos in the person of Jesus Christ alone, and must reject with like decision every transfer of the conception, whether it be to other human persons or to beings of a different race."

But how now is the restriction of this condescension to the case of the *human* race to be explained ? According to the soteriological theory, by its special need of redemption ; it is the lost sheep, over against the ninety and nine which are left behind for its rescue, Matth. xviii : 12 ; the good angels are supposed to require no similar grace for their perfection ; while the fallen angels are regarded as too deeply lost to be capable of any redemption. But take the other view, by which the incarnation is supposed necessary without sin ; what reason then can be given for this restriction ? No other it would seem than this, that the human nature in itself considered stands nearer to the Divine nature, to the Logos, than all created intelligence besides. It is preferred thus, not for its moral misery and want, but for its metaphysical excellence and worth. The transaction serves not so much to magnify the riches of Divine grace, as to illustrate the comparative dignity of the human race.

Unless however we reason in a circle from the mere fact of the distinction itself, which it is pretended to account for by its means, this fancy is found destitute of all biblical proof. The angels are styled also sons of God ; they stand in near union with him, more close at present certainly than that to which man is admitted ; they excel man in knowledge ; the state of the resurrection is even described expressly as being "like unto the angels." In the view of the Bible thus, the image of God in which man is said to have been created is not peculiar to him, but belongs to all personal beings ; as indeed the idea of their personality itself implies. Nay, the deeper fall of the lost angels would seem to show that their first state was higher than the original condition of man ; which in fact the whole christian world has always believed.

The human race, we may believe, has indeed a great and wide end to serve in the general economy of creation ; not however as standing higher than other personal intelligences, but as

standing comparatively lower. According to our author, the very extremity of the case, and the difficulty of the conditions involved in it, would seem to be that which invests the work of redemption here with its special significance and interest. Sin itself becomes thus the occasion of such a display of Divine love as could not otherwise have place. This redounds to the distinction of the human race; and as it is the *human nature* that is glorified by its union with the Logos, in the work of redemption, he is to be regarded as standing to this nature in a relation of special intimacy and appropriation; in such way that the glorification of the redeemed is always a process of conformation to the image of the God-man, a partaking of his glory, the entrance into them of Christ's being and life. Redemption is more than the simple restitution of man's primitive integrity; what we gain in Christ is something incomparably greater than what we have lost in Adam.

Here however we are bound to use great caution, that the relation in question be not so taken as to break down the conception of the true and proper boundary, that must ever hold necessarily between the nature of the creature and that of the Creator. The principle of man's union with God is *love*; which implies full personal distinction, and here also distinction of substance or essence. If such union overthrew the substantiality of the creature, causing it to lose itself in the Divine substance, it would be in truth no union but only destruction. God's love then would be in its action like hatred, absorbing or annihilating its object. The view which assumes the necessity of the incarnation independently of sin, Müller thinks, is particularly exposed to the danger of falling into this unethical apprehension of the nature of our relation to Christ; according to which, man is to be regarded as coming to a sort of deification, an actual unity of *essence* with the Logos, in virtue of his humanity. Every such imagination of course, whether it be open or latent only and disguised, reduces the existence of the creature to a mere unsubstantial show, and ends necessarily in the yawning gulph of pantheism.

"But, now, if according to all that has been said the theory of the original necessity of the incarnation cannot be maintained, what view must we take of the *idea of the God-man*, beyond which certainly no higher idea is to be thought of as the *εἶδος* of the Divine scheme of the world, and which therefore must necessarily be the central idea, around which all the other parts of creation revolve, as they find in it also their union and end? Does not the Apostle Paul say expressly in this sense,

Col. i: 16, 17, that the universe is created in Christ and for him, and that by him all things consist?

"Here different points of view are usually blended together, which need to be kept distinct.—So much the soteriological theory of the incarnation also must hold for settled, that Christ is the turning point of history, that the cross on Golgotha is the boundary where its centrifugal tendency became centripetal. Was the first Adam the commencement only of a process of natural life, which through the force of sin became a constantly growing departure from God; the second Adam is the author of a process of spiritual life, which rests in no end short of complete fellowship with God, 1 Cor. xv: 45 f. But the thought before us goes beyond this; it means that humanity, and so the world at large, has been originally formed with reference to the God-man and to union with him and under him as a head. Here also there is at bottom a deep truth, which is only half misunderstood. The end of all created life as it lies in God's mind, ideally viewed must be placed in such a free union of the personal creature with him, as shall cause it to be in full the organ of God, filled and glorified with his life, and as shall enable it, in virtue of the perfect holiness and bliss to which it is thus raised, to raise the rest of the creation also, after its way and measure, into a participation of the glorious liberty of the children of God. This world of personality, however, thus united with God, is in his eternal idea viewed as a whole, made up of manifold individuals joined together complementally as its members, and so as a kingdom of created intelligences, which as such remain substantially distinct from God, while he is in them still as all in all. The Logos now, as the absolute image of the Father and the hypostatical principle of his self-revelation *ad extra*, stands with all beings created in the image of God, that is with all personal creatures, in deep specific correspondence. As this principle he is the bearer of the Divine idea of the world, which comes to its focus in the conception of created personality; and in such view he is also the Mediator of all these intelligences as actually existing, Mediator in a universal sense that must be carefully distinguished from the soteriological, the Revealer of God for them in a purely inward way and by virtue of his dwelling in their spirit, and the sovereign king who conducts their history to its absolute end and completion; for only in communion with God can man, or any personal creature, rise to communion with God, whether directly or in the way of return from sin. Here we have in view the normal development of created personality, and in this sense it is undoubtedly true, that

man in his very origin is formed for Christ, namely as the Logos. The human nature is primitively disposed for the incarnation, just as all created personality is so in being made for communion with God. What since the fall the Holy Ghost is now for humanity in the sphere of redemption, and what before this redemption took place the Logos never ceased to be for the same humanity, though only as a light shining in darkness, that he would have been for it entirely and in full if it had gone forward without the disorder of sin; so that in this sense also the Holy Ghost is the representative of Christ, (John xiv: 16, xvi: 7,) here of course as the Logos. And thus all that is truly noble and great in antiquity, in which a higher inspiration comes into view pushing aside for the moment the narrow interests of selfishness, is to be referred to the immanent operation of the Logos as its source; some sense of which indeed we have even in that memorable word of the earnest Roman philosopher: *Nemo vir magnus sine afflatu divino unquam fuit*. Now however, since the entrance of redemption, all true elevation, in the case of man, springs from the Holy Ghost, and so stands inseparably connected with the pursuit of holiness, with the consciousness of personal sin and strenuous endeavors to be delivered from its power."

The passage, Col. i: 15-17, refers to this primitive relation to the Logos, and not to what he is for the world by the incarnation. This is implied by the title *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, the first-born of the whole creation. In this view it is also, that Christ in his state of exaltation, having again the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, John xvii: 5, is described by the apostles as Lord and Head, not only of the Church, but also of the angels in their various classes and orders; comp. Eph. i: 21, Col. ii: 10, 1 Peter iii: 22, and the *ἀνκεφαλαίον* Eph. i: 10.

If this view of the ideal order of the world in the Divine mind be correct, all else becomes *means* for carrying it out to its appointed end. These are conditioned, in the everlasting omniscience of God, by the vast and mighty disorder which has been brought into the world by sin. The reality of this is so fearful, the catastrophe it involves so great, that to meet it properly required on the part of Divine love not merely a slight modification of its plan as arranged to proceed without sin, but the introduction of a new provision, the most wonderful invention of this love, the awfully glorious mystery of the incarnation. This takes its place thus indeed among the *means* which God employs to carry out the plan of the world, the centre in

which all means meet that have for their object the overthrow of sin; a thought, which loses its difficulty just in proportion as we are brought to look into the abyss of evil and at the same time into the depths of Divine love.

It is only the fact of sin in truth, apprehended in its world-vast solemnity and significance, that furnishes an adequate reason for the highest act of God's love. The sense of this fact therefore must lead the way in every effort that is made successfully, to understand or interpret the christological mystery.

The distinguished writer, whom we have been trying to follow in this article in the way of free synopsis, is careful to tell us that he has no idea of charging the perilous consequences, which he is led to point out as apparently flowing from the theory he reviews, on such excellent men as Liebner and others who have stood forward in its defence. He regards them rather as fellow laborers with himself on the same platform of evangelical freedom, and has no doubt but that they have in their own way of looking at the subject what are supposed to be sufficient precautions against these consequences. His object is accordingly to open the way for their bringing out still more fully and distinctly the entire sense of their system, in all its aspects and bearings. "This inquiry proposes to be nothing more," he says, "than an excitement to a new revision of the christological theory in question, on the basis of the true biblical theism, and to a solution if possible of the difficulties now presented; for which very reason it has been felt necessary to give them the most sharp and distinct expression. If they can be shown to be groundless, of course on the basis just mentioned, the writer would not wish to be among the last certainly to embrace a view, the special advantages of which for the scientific construction of christian doctrine he can fully appreciate."

J. W. N.

THE SCOTCH IRISH ELEMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY.

THE return of the Eagle Wing to Ireland and debarkation of her disconcerted company at Lockfergus, Nov. 3rd, 1636, formed an incident in the world's chronicles, that in its results has exerted an influence upon the destinies of the United States next to that of the memorable event which has consecrated the Rock of Plymouth among New England reminiscences. The whole adventure was mortifying in the highest degree, and beyond surmise afforded rare sport to the laughers of the time. But those brave pilgrims might have consoled themselves, if they did not, with the reflection that an ordeal of great humiliation and reproach has in manifold instances proved, like the tomb of Christ, a watch-house of angels from which the exodus of a regenerated refined humanity has insured, in the end, a nobler life and destiny to different sections of the human family. The bird of flame rising from its ashes with stronger and more beautiful wings, parables a majestic truth: Had Hamilton, Livingston, Blair, and McClelland, gained with their associates the New England coast, and settled, as was proposed, upon the banks of the Merrimac, they would undoubtedly have lost in a short time their distinctive peculiarities under the plastic hand of Puritanism. We fancy then, the tempestuous north-wester which swept so fiercely around the ship's mast head, and drove back the dispirited adventurers to Lockfergus, was nothing less than one of God's strong angels. It was not for these predestinated patriarchs of the Scotch Irish family to resist the judgment of fate;—it was not for them to contravene the designs of Providence in reference to the true mission of their race. The horoscope of that race was already cast.

Through the latter half of the seventeenth century, the Court of Louis the Fourteenth was to civilized Europe the cynosure of the political world. Statesmen on all sides were accustomed to scan with anxious eyes the bearings in council and camp of Mazarine and Turenne, the first stars of that constellation, and therefrom vaticinate the fortunes of mankind. During the same active period the province of Ulster, remote from the polished centres of European civilization, comprised within its borders an obscure Scottish colony, whose very existence was unrecorded by the great authors of the time. No modern Elijah then stood upon the top of Carmel, and discerned the little cloud arising from the sea like a man's hand. There nevertheless, unregar-

ded and unknown, the Covenanter rocked the cradle of liberty amid provincial turbulence, and prepared an element of power which, the next century, entered largely into the structure of the American model of constitutional freedom :—a model which the French people, forgetting the religion and loyalty of ages, transformed into a divinity, whose carnival they celebrated upon the ruins of the Bourbon dynasty.

Let us not be understood, for a moment, as designing to present here a surprising instance of the frustration of human prescience,—a magnificent case of “turning of the tables” in which the scene is shifted through the civilized world, and the time of exhibition extends through centuries. We do not think of this ; for such ups and downs form no anomalies in human history. We wish first to engage transient attention to the inference that a pure faith and sound principles not only tend to elevate the moral life of a people, as every body knows, but, in the long race, are better adapted than profound diplomacy and gigantic power to insure the equivalents of terrene prosperity and renown. We desire however chiefly, through the passing sunshine cast by the Scotch Irish episode upon the surface of the historic stream, to draw attention to the deep divine flow beneath.

History, as regarded in its familiar civil import, comes before us like Banvard's Panorama of the Mississippi, displaying by successive pictorial illustrations the majestic stream of human events, and giving perhaps, at each view, a useful lesson to the living world audience. No one however who discerns merely the human pencilling here can trace the moral of the exhibition in its largest sense. In a higher view the human must be counted as symbolic. History then must be deciphered like the Rosetta stone. It is God's symbolic registry ; and the thoughts and deeds of men wrought into it are but hieroglyphs which convey to the thoughtful the strong and consistent development of the divine purposes. In truth, with Christ for our Champollion, we may find the true philosophy of all history here, as it serves to unfold the great mind of God in his providence.

We have felt some chagrin, we honestly confess, at the neglect which the Scotch Irish have experienced from historians of American colonization. In vain, for example, do we look for the “exile of Erin” through Bancroft's picture gallery of the colonists. There is the Puritan limned again and again, with filial reverence and partiality, at the different stages of his career. Aye, there look out upon us his progressive portraits, reminding us forcibly of the old prints, that used to solemnize our juvenile thoughts, in which the successive decennial periods of human

life, by a striking prosopopeia are made to follow each other over the arc of a semicircle. There is the Virginia Planter in full costume,—and the story of his renown, drawn with “the point of a diamond,” detailing the whole budget of romantic incident which distinguished his career *on this side the water*. All very well, as he had little to boast of among the colonial confessors in the way of trans-atlantic sufferings for either civil or religious rights. There too are the marked features of the Quaker. We see him as, with unearthly look, he emerged in England from his celestial school-house: We see him again in the midst of his early persecutions, looking like a great glad boy who shouts merrily in the howling whirlwind that is forcing and following him along. And we had him again in the quiet vernal morning of Pennsylvania—as glorious as the morning, bargaining with the Red men under primeval trees. The Huguenot, the Hollander, and the Scottish colonist of East Jersey, all receive a fugitive sketch: but the Scotch-Irishman, with his honest friend the German, has been suffered to pass through into the background, without the grace of a formal introduction. Whence this neglect? Is it forsooth because these comrades came late upon the ground? Our historian should not have forgotten the catholic scope of the lesson, taught in the divine apologue of the laborers who were sent at different hours of the day into the vineyard. There is a homebred prejudice potent in its influence existing in every community, enlisted as by some magnetic charm in behalf of what are termed “old families.” These families, sprung from fortunate land speculators of an early day, are seldom found in the front of those improvements which give dignity to the age; nay, as a body, they more frequently incline to obstruct the course of progress and reform. Yet their time-honored domains and lombardy poplars, acting like a prism, invest them with a fictitious glory, under which they claim and receive general homage. Upon the same principle, we suppose, the descendants of the earlier colonists, of those particularly over whose nativity the venerable elms of England waved their ennobling shadows, have exacted for their ancestral lineage down to themselves the chief place of honor among the elementary constituents of American Society. But, in all seriousness, we believe that our great historians have not done justice to the Scotch-Irish. A race which has dignified the military annals of the country by contributing thereto the great names of Montgomery, Stark, Wayne, Sullivan, and Jackson; which has furnished to the counsels of the nation a like proportion of eminent civilians, from Madison down to Calhoun; which has given

three incumbents to the Presidential chair:—a race which has undoubtedly established the leading features of society throughout Pennsylvania, in large sections of Maryland, through the middle and western portions of Virginia, and over the greater part of North Carolina; and which embracing as it ever did an enterprising yeomanry, early pushed its fortunes westward, and staked out the landmarks of Tennessee and Kentucky; and first peopled the southern moiety of that portion of the North-west territory, comprising the present States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois:—such a race, had it brought, like the German,¹ nothing more than sturdy material forces into the country, would have been entitled to the respectful consideration of impartial history.* But when we consider the effective political philosophy it cast into the scale, as attested by a careful view of external evidences, and confirmed by the Westminster type so strikingly mirrored in the fabric of our liberties, we confidently aver that no delineation can present a full true history of American freedom, as to its organic conditions, which fails to depict the origin, principles, and discipline, of the Ulster Presbyterians. The political tenets of the emigrant from Ulster, like a shadow, ever took the outlines of his ecclesiastical creed; and in the representative scheme of his presbytery was involved the republican principle, which found room for its embodiment here in kindred forms of civil government.

Energetic conservatism is the most prominent trait discernible

¹ We are far from intending any disparagement. But the German mind, with all its sterling worth, through difference of language, has been, until recently, a sealed casket.

"The most numerous settlers in the north western part of Carolina are Protestants chiefly Presbyterians from the north of Ireland." Again, "a considerable part of N. Carolina is inhabited by those people or their descendants." Again, "They migrated in thousands to Pennsylvania, a province in which the principles of civil and religious liberty had their full operation."—*History of N. Carolina*, by H. Williamson, L. L. D.

"The place is a new settlement, generally settled with people from Ireland, as all our congregations in Pennsylvania, except two or three, chiefly are made up of people from that kingdom."—*Letter of Samuel Blair*, 1740.

"Then (1737) commenced a tide of emigration from the province of Ulster, Ireland, that spread over a beautiful section of Virginia, and filled up her wild borders with a peculiar race. The influence of that race of men on Virginia, in making her what she is, &c." Again, "After the choice locations in Pennsylvania and Maryland were filled up they crossed the Potomac, &c." Again, "When the most inviting regions in this southern direction were occupied the succeeding immigrants (from Ulster,) crossed the Alleghanies, and soon filled West Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Tennessee."—*Sketches of Virginia* by W. H. Foote, D. D.

in the character of the Scotch-Irish. They regard with constitutional dislike the radical leanings of freethinking Puritanism. Law and order, as they exist in the government of their choice, are to them a genuine rescript from heaven ; and their civil obligations they revere as they do the precepts of their Bibles. It is impiety with them to be disloyal to the government, which throws a just protection over their rights. With this attribute of character in the ascendant, they were highly qualified for the geographical position assigned them by Providence in the United States. Thus whilst the dignity of civilization, wealth and power, brightened the vast Indian regions through which their migration rolled westward, the States they formed, north and south, were at the same time welded together by strong fraternal sympathies. The ligaments which connect the descendants of the Scotch Irish family on both sides of the slavery line, constitute to this day the strongest bond of the American Union. It was their destiny, in furtherance of their mission, to usurp the birthright of the Quaker. The benison intended for Esau fell upon Jacob.

The true genius of Quakerism is contemplative, not active. As with Adam in Paradise, its initial life was crowned at once with all the sturdy qualities of manhood. Fox, Penn, and Barclay, formed its glowing meridian, which has been preceded by no morning. It stalked forth suddenly in Europe divinely equipped for its world mission, like the mythological Pallas, or, as it aspired to be, like the apostles after the descent of cloven tongues : and then only, when under the thrilling supposition of its celestial ordination it tossed to and fro in delirious ecstasy, was the power of its arm felt in the world. This Pentecost proved a poor type of its subsequent historic life. The phrenzy of the seer subsided at length into the philosophy of the sage. Quakerism withdrew to its own quiet fireside to contemplate alone the "inner light," and left the world out-doors to mind itself. The genius of Quakerism is stationary if not retrogressive, and like the fabled Narcissus has taken root in adoring its own image. When the bursting hosannas with which it glorified its own advent had subsided, its temper assumed the mould, which, but little impaired by the decadence of two centuries, it has retained until the present time. By reason of its reserved antiquated social attitude, its voice has never been influential in the States. Its periodical protests against slavery and war, like the strikings of a clock in the room where we sit, are seldom heard at all. Blessings on the Pennsylvania Quaker nevertheless, for the home he freely tendered the fugitive for conscience

sake!—for the agricultural domains, and “freedom to worship God,” in its copious sense, he gave the stranger!—a boon the Puritan of Massachusetts or Connecticut could not find it in his heart to bestow, nor the Virginia Cavalier! Blessings on the Quaker! But there ended his precedence; for with his refined feminine scruples on the subjects of physical resistance and military duty, his ascetic notions of social propriety, and the neutral and negative predominant in his psychological life, he was incapable of directing to a beneficial issue the wild progress of the Anglo-Saxon in the western world. The frame work of his system has no congruity to the architectural orders of living society. It is a century behind, or may be, in some of its characteristics a century in advance of the times!

The Scotch Irish wrenched the sceptre from the Quaker's hand. They came with their coats off ready to enter upon the world work for which they had served, in their own green island, a centennial apprenticeship. Combining the conditions of energy, piety and conservatism, they were just suited to the exigencies of the people, whose social and civil progress they were destined to control. The population among which they have had their mission is chiefly of English and German origin. Some other races are represented here and there like sprinkling rain-drops.

Here we are in doubt how to proceed. Shall we attempt to sketch the German, the Cavalier, the Huguenot or the Swede, and exhibit the improvement, if any, wrought in his nature from Scotch Irish interminglings and infusions? Or shall we closely follow, like the sunflower, our luminary? Shall we contemplate in the Scotch Irishman those qualities which, like solar beams, have vivified the circle of his social horizon? We are perplexed,—like a stranger in New-York at the Five Points. We survey the subjects before us, as did the modest knight of *Ivanhoe* the fair ladies who graced the Lists of Ashby. But in humble imitation we will do as did that paragon of knighthood,—who brightened the visions of our boyhood,—we will plant ourselves, lance in hand, before our kith and kin; and, were it only ours, we would deposit the “coronet of green with its circlet of gold” at the feet of our own true Saxon, maugre the phlegm of the German, or the curling lip of the Planter! This question settled we advance, with a heart glowing from the effects of the spontaneous flash of chivalry we have displayed.

Calvinism and the Presbyterian polity have operated powerfully on the Scotch Irish nature, and developed therein two pre-eminent characteristics: first, from the Scotch side of the house,

stability, next a beneficial moral and educational tendency. The stability of this race has been fully tested by the uniform drift of their character since known as a distinct people. Their religious scheme, their politics, their domestic and sacred customs, form a harmonious economy, admitting at no time important changes or modifications. They reverence the symbols and forms their forefathers established, and which an emerald antiquity has at length sanctified, with all the passion that men in a new country generally have for novelty and change. This feature, true to the letter in all the rural districts, is but slightly compromised even at the great centres of trade. The stable character of their institutions is maintained against foreign influences, by means of the greatest precaution and providence. The vigilance, for instance, with which in their churches they guard the approach to the Lord's table, calls to mind the sternness employed at the gate of Eden "to keep the way of the tree of life." Their practice does not sanction the establishment of nurseries for novices from the world. They have no naturalization system, no spiritual vestibules for catechumens. They repudiate the entire doctrine of middle states, from purgatory downwards. They remember the moral taught in Esop's fable of the countryman warming the torpid viper. The neophyte must prove himself correct upon vexed theological questions outside the house: he must be established in doctrine and grace before he can be admitted within. He then when he enters takes his predestined place, and gives at once strong aid toward the consolidation of the spiritual temple: he is like the stones employed in the building of that other temple upon which the sound of hammers and axes was not heard.

The conservation of the Scotch Irish character contrasts broadly with the opposite temper of New England Puritanism. The prominent characteristics of the latter, intellectual irresponsibility and ecclesiastical independence, have wrought deeply upon its history,—beside much that is good—the dark symbols of doctrinal libertinism both in respect to church and state. Puritanism is ever in a transition state. Would you take its proportions, you must employ stenographic notes, for the form you see is but the chrysalis of a new life, almost ready to come upon the stage and bow to the public. Aye, with a sort of moral vandalism, it has entered the most holy place, and subjected to mutilation the "ark of the testimony" of the Pilgrim fathers. Sacrilegious speculation has broken this venerable heirloom into fragments.¹

¹ We read some time ago in a Boston paper, that Dr. Woods of Andover

The next characteristic mentioned as resulting, in some sort, from the Westminster baptism of the Scotch Irish was a sound moral and educational tendency. The religious system which, aside from higher objects, promotes the happiness of the people and renders the country prosperous where its influence is dominant, must undoubtedly, so far as human considerations prevail, be wisely conceived, in any scheme of church polity. History and observation both confirm the statement, that where Calvinistic theology has prevailed, especially under presbyterial forms as in Scotland, not only has the administration of the state been marked by energy and success, but the condition of society in its subordinate details has ever been distinguished by simplicity and probity. Western Pennsylvania, in every community of which the Scotch Irish race forms the ruling element, affords an instance to our hand with which we are most familiar. Often in our short excursions through Alleghany, Washington, and Fayette counties, we have paused to behold the panorama of domestic life embraced in some picturesque settlement, and to consider the evidences of prosperity and careless security abounding on every side. The rights of property were respected by sound universal practice. Here for example we saw the implements of husbandry, at sunset, lying in the distant grain-field, far from the guardianship of the household: as a common thing, they lay scattered day and night carelessly around the homestead. Again we would observe the valuable effects of some wayfarer deposited for the night upon the open porch; this same apartment being perhaps the permanent receptacle of a full tithe of the family wealth,—its angles and sides being lined with the perpetual bag of corn-meal, a sett or two of harness, and a motley collection of mechanical tools. Upon closer inquisition we might have found the house-bolt, procured during the primeval troubles,—the time of Indian inroads or of the Whiskey insurrection—all rusted in its keep. But for protection against merry mad urchins upon Hallowmass eve its use had grown wholly obsolete, for in these agricultural districts the crime of burglary was unknown. We saw the accomplishment of prophecy around us: "They shall dwell safely and none shall make them afraid." Perhaps, for we profess to have some candor, the kaleidoscope of a kindred lineage threw, to our eyes, a more touching light

was delivering a series of lectures, showing what the theology of the Puritans is. We should like to see Theodore Parker's version of the old Puritan type placed beside the Andover Doctor's.

over monuments which so forcibly illustrated the integrity of society.

The high-wrought religious organization of the Scotch Irishman led him to commit the wealth of his mind and heart to the keeping of his faith. He habitually looked upon the world through the telescope of the Gospel,—that telescope whose lenses had been adjusted for him by Calvin and John Knox. Thus he saw that a sound system of education was needed to mellow the common mind, for the reception of the seminal principles of civil and religious liberty; and accordingly true to the part assigned him in the great western drama, he erected in every settlement the school-house as the next condition of society to the church. He planted academies; and established his famous log colleges in Pennsylvania, that were—to mention human means—the mainsprings of religious awakenings which made “the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord.” In these, and in similar institutions of an improved character, which he subsequently founded in Virginia, he always conceded to the clergy the highest chairs of instruction, in order that the spirit of the learned professions and influential circles, whose strength was recruited from these scholastic retreats, might be tempered by the graces of piety. We close our argument on this part by repeating, with side glances at Geneva and the Scotch Kirk, the aphorism which dropped from the lips of the Saviour: “The tree is known by his fruit.”

Another striking trait in the Scotch Irishman's character is sensibility. His ardent sympathetic nature, derived from the Irish side of the family, elevates him in some respects as a public teacher above his great intellectual rival the Puritan. His eloquence is characteristically impassioned. In the Senate and even at the Bar—not to mention stump-oratory—his thoughts generally are strongly marked by the colorings of the heart: and his earnest solemn monitions from the Pulpit, like morning sunbeams among dew-drops, charm and impress the more for their shimmering upon us through tears. The soul-entrancing epilogues of Grattan, Kirwan¹ and Emmett, were but the lofty utterance of the great national heart. The glory of the orator here was the glory of interpreting most effectively the higher Irish feeling; and any claim to this feeling as a mere personal endowment would have resembled the daring impiety of Moses and Aaron at Meribah.

¹ Not of course Dr. Murray.

Passion is essential to the existence of true symmetrical humanity. Remove it, and with the separation, the productions of genius lose their tropical fragrance. It is the best interpreter of human destiny; for the great future, which appalls the vision of the pure mind, by unfolding thereto a stern shadowy realm governed by unalterable institutes, becomes under the vernal breathings of sensibility a rich and holy world. There is profound religious truth in heart teachings. The heart will leap, like the Baptist in the womb, through strong sympathy when the *Divine* and *Eternal* draw near, although the mind, tethered within its charmed philosophical circle, may not comprehend in full the nature or fact of the august presence. It is foolishness to the Greeks. The Scotch Irish preacher, whilst he thoroughly prepares his subject for the pulpit, discards when there the aid of written notes. His emotion, when contemplating before him in the church Adam's fallen race, are not such as might be called up in his study, and chained down under the symbols of his manuscript. Around him he looks upon dear kindred souls ready to perish: solemn breezes from the eternal world come wafting by him; and the rushing of angelic wings is heard, like the dread portents of general doom! He stands like Aaron between the living and the dead, that the plague may be stayed! Passion of soul produced by such influences cannot be seized by any art, and fettered in alphabetic characters, to be recited in measured cadences. Whitefield, whose spiritual life, with all its organic peculiarities, had been strengthened under a different system of gymnastics, found, among a large portion of the Scotch Irish ministry in Pennsylvania and Virginia, enthusiasm cognate to his own. "Night was as it were turned into day when we rode singing through the woods," exclaimed this apostolic evangelist in reference to his intercourse with the Tennents, Finely, and Blair. This sanguine temperament has proved an effectual auxiliary in promoting those wonderful revivals, which have, from time to time, enlarged the borders of the Scotch Irish church, both in Ulster and through the United States.

The capital, so to speak, brought by our Scottish bridegroom to Ulster on the day of his espousals was, as has been seen, a vigorous religious system. We have already judged that system by its fruits, viz: its fine conservative and social effects upon the household. We have also mentioned the bride's marriage dowry, namely the Golconda of a rich glowing heart;—revealing whence the life and coloring have come, which are always found to animate the faithful canvas of the bluestocking family. We come now to speak more particularly of the political education

of the house, and of the spirit of liberty fostered under these parental influences, which was habitually displayed by the race. It is with some degree of pride we approach this topic, for its consideration makes known the great and peculiar honor which belongs to the Protestant Irishman. A carefully formed estimate of religious liberty constituted a base, upon which his opinions of political rights rested, and with which they ever stood combined, forming a consistent piece "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." The democratic idea, that the authority of the magistrate emanates from the people, was incorporated at an early day in the Scotch Irish creed. "Men are called to the magistracy by the suffrage of the people whom they govern,"—solemnly responded one of their ministers in the name of his brethren to an English Parliamentary committee in 1650. This fundamental principle in republican politics was but the faithful image of the great church doctrine which embroiled them in perpetual conflicts with English prelacy, and led them finally to choose a home in the American forests, viz: the popular right in respect to electing pastors, and determining the forms of worship. It was the amplification of these twin doctrines, aided by an old grudge against a government, which, notwithstanding their prowess at Londonderry and the Boyne, had never done them justice, that furnished them with sufficient reasons for assuming in their adopted country the initiative in the American Revolution;—by resisting on the banks of the Alamance the militia of Gov. Tryon, in 1771, and promulgating from Mecklenburg Court-house, North Carolina, in May 1775, the first bold manifest looking firmly at the scheme of colonial independence. The same doctrines, endeared yet more and consecrated through conflict and trial, drew from the mountains and vallies of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, to meet the demands of the Revolutionary contest, a hardy intelligent yeomanry, whose inflexible devotion to popular liberty has justly won for the Presbyterian Bluestocking the highest grade of canonization in the temple of freedom. But we design not here to paint the physical prowess of the Scotch Irish. Their true mission was more sublime. It was their glory to be the great champions in America of the rights of the soul. In Virginia they confronted alone for generations an intolerant hierarchy, in behalf of conscience and the dissenting portion of the colony.¹ We confess

¹ The revised Act for Conformity 1642 ran thus: "For the preservation of purity of doctrine and unity of the church, It is enacted that all minis-

now to a sentiment, which in no other connexion, we firmly maintain, has at any time mingled with the vanities of our brightest castle-building. It is an aspiration after the honor of writing a book,—a history of the development of spiritual freedom in the country. We would therein show how this cause, through gloomy ages, heard its truest utterances from the lips of the Scotch Irish clergy. Emotions sad, wild, and joyous, pour like a flood through the heart, whenever we consider the determined self-denying crusade of these knight-templars. Their pathway in life, in its worldly look, led through briers and thorns. Many of them went to rest leaving the great work unfinished: yet patient, Christ-like in their charity, they fell one by one, faithful witnesses of the truth, brightening with rich smiles death's approaches, at the hopeful thought that their children or their children's children would, in their day, string the lyre of freedom to full harmony, and pour its triumphant notes through the vallies and hills of the dear "Old Dominion." Francis McKemie, the Scotch Irish apostle of the colonies, entered the country in 1683 or '84, and labored principally in Maryland and Virginia. There were some scenes in the life of this great man which would have embellished the best pages written by the ancients upon moral sublimity. Paul before Agrippa, or Luther at Worms, furnished not to Italian or Flemish artists a purer or more elevated study in moral æsthetics than is presented in McKemie's trial at New-York, 1707, for preaching without Lord Cornbury's license the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Jerusalem and the old Germanic Absolutism in the back-ground of the great Apostle and great Reformer lessen by their historic consonance the sense of mighty wrong, and thus fail to produce in full that thrilling effect which the lofty relieve of the American scene drawn against the free green forests of the occident must ever awaken. Davies, engrafted upon the Scotch Irish stock, and reflecting by his illustrious generalship, like Marshal McDonald who led the brilliant charge of Wagram, transcendent glory upon the race of his adoption. Waddel, whose immortal portrait has given its chief popular renown to the pencil of Wirt, Graham and the two Smiths, loom upon the holy battle

ters whatsoever which shall shall reside in the colony are to be conformable to the orders and constitutions of the church of England, and the laws therein established, and not otherwise to be admitted to teach or preach publicly or privately, And that the Governor and Council do take care that all non-conformists upon notice of them shall be compelled to depart the colony with all convenience."

plain in almost superhuman proportions. We have examined with some care a half-dozen memorials in behalf of religious liberty, which were presented by the Hanover Presbytery to the General Assembly of Virginia, during and after the period of the Revolution, until 1785, about the close of which year the famous bill of religious rights was passed. These documents, in our humble judgement, compare favorably in style and contents with the cleverest State papers of that most brilliant period in the annals of Virginia. They are distinguished by comprehensive thought, clear appreciation, great political sagacity, and dignified monitive earnestness. This clerical body mainly represented the yeomanry, whose backing gave strength and confidence to Henry, Jefferson, and Madison, through the various phases the religious question assumed before its final settlement. That yeomanry consisted principally, it is known, of the Scotch Irish and German races. The German, whose sympathies and conscience were strongly enlisted in this cause, was shorn of his proper strength and prominence in the conflict by reason of his foreign language. The moral force, therefore, which his known feelings and his numbers gave to the right side, was skillfully employed in the struggle by his more fortunate comrade.

We cannot, before we close this part of our subject, restrain a passing comment on the singular association by which these two races have been marked in their entire American migration. Upon mountain slope or plain, in forest or prairie, on river or lake they are always found side by side. It is not our privilege to compare their mutual attachment to the hallowed delicate relationship of David and Jonathan, whose souls were knit together like the bodies of the Siamese Twins; nor to the exalted classic friendship of Damon and Pythias, which sets off like a diamond the live-long eloquence of the rural Academy. Alas, poetry and the transcendental philosophy, which, somewhat after the manner of Jacob's pilled rods, promote the conception of this noble ringstreaked offspring of the affections, are the exclusive property of the higher Germanic life! The harp of Schiller, which ranged as gloriously as ever did that of Apollo through its lordly diapasons, poured its majestic symphonies only upon the cultivated heart of the fatherland; and the refined lineaments of that heart alone brightened and glowed with dream-like beauty under the divine cognitions of Kant. The drama-colored sacrificing of self upon the altar of romantic sentiment is therefore a part of the tragedy, which, as far as the German is concerned, the fatherland mystics must enact. It implies a condition of soul which is not distributed, like the love of God,

without "respect of persons." Our American German generally presents a less exalted type of feeling. He has never enjoyed the *intuition* of the modern Eleusinian Mysteries: The mystic word, the *Feldgeschrei*, required by the hierophants is still Greek to him. But withal, his common-sense, methodical, child-like temper, with its every whim, yet with its golden fortune of truthfulness, suits our taste to a tie. His companionship with the Scotch Irish is marked, on both sides, by strong practical sympathy. We may, by reversing the rules of rhetoric and comparing great things to small, trace a very distant similitude between this unsophisticated attachment and the bond which holds between the crusty fretted urchin and his impatient elder brother, who are wending their way, hand in hand, by maternal direction, to the district school. The lads may torment each other,—they may scold like parrots, but, with all that, doubt not their mutual affection: for should danger assail one, the other true as steel will side with him against the whole world of boyhood.

We now ask the grace of our readers whilst we trip lightly through some adjuncts of our subject which we have no wish to survey at large, and then we'll make our exit. The religious element, as we have seen, is the loadstone of the Scotch Irish mind. In all their primitive settlements the "Meeting-house" was the orb, around which social and civil as well as spiritual interests constantly revolved, and whose monitory radii swept without a shadow the purlieus of the entire community. The pulpit was the oracle, whose infallible utterances decided all the grave questions of the day, and, by condescending to define the common proprieties of conduct, gave dignity to social and domestic scruples. Parents, in accordance with the bluestocking notions entertained in regard to the sanctification of the Sabbath, brought methodically all the members of the household, down to the newly baptized babe, to the church. Accordingly, during the time of religious service, it was sometimes impossible, in consequence of the crying of infants, for a stranger, who might be present, to follow the logic of the sacred desk. Not so with the descendant of the Covenanter! There he sat,—like a vision looming up from the far off realm of our boyhood,—with his coat off in the sultry summer day, and his still blue eye upturned upon the glowing face of the good old preacher, and the sabbatic side of his mind profoundly intent on the concrete disquisition of the day! There he sat; and, as they tell us that the plaintive guitar used to aid with its familiar accompaniment the ancient troubadour in composing and reciting his extempore bal-

lads, so here the wail of infancy, with the occasional snarling and conflict of petty curs, far from distracting our auditor, seemed in truth to nerve his mind and endue it with additional reach and power for digesting the pending theme. The conditions of distance and weather, so generally paramount considerations, had little to do with the attendance at church of the Scotch Irish. Judge Wilkeson in the *American Pioneer* thus describes this trait of their character in Western Pennsylvania. "It was common for families to ride from ten to fifteen miles to meeting. The young people regularly walked five or six miles, and in summer carried their stockings and shoes, if they had any, in their hands. I believe that no houses of worship were erected in the country until about 1790. Even in winter the meetings were held in the open air. A grove was selected, a log pulpit was erected, and logs furnished the audience with seats. Among the men who attended public worship in winter, ten were obliged to substitute a blanket or coverlet for a great-coat, where one enjoyed the luxury of that article."

The Old School Presbyterian Church, which in all its borders embraces the manly energy of the Scotch Irish element, presents in a religious form the hereditary conservatism of the race. Devoted as this body has ever been to the support of liberty, and anxious as it is for its constitutional extension, as was made abundantly apparent by the conduct of that section of it found in Kentucky, which, with Robert Breckenridge at its head, struggled almost to a man to give the emancipation sentiment the ascendancy in the recent State Convention; yet by its General Assembly, as well as by its lower courts, it has breasted from the first the storm of Abolitionism which for years has menaced the integrity of the Union. The polity of the Federal government, which is constructed so closely upon the model of Presbytery, and whose foundations were cemented with the blood of its holy men, has been ever cherished by this church, like the image of Diana by the Ephesians, as a sacred gift from heaven. In it they hold up to a distracted desponding world an element of promise and power,—the brazen serpent of nations. They would resist to a man then all measures tending to imperil the Federal Compact; holding it justly to be the grandest exterior adumbration of their church scheme, the hearthstone upon which the branches of their scattered family may meet in the Western world, and the grand model of democratic efficiency provided divinely for the direction of the nations.

It seems to us, indeed, as we look back at the proposition with which we set out, that the changeful glowing map of our coun-

try, when historically considered, reflects, to the view of the philanthropist, the beneficent mind of God as manifestly as ever did the "molten looking glass" of the oriental heavens to the wondering gaze of sage or shepherd. And, to be particular, we think that the remarkable adaptation of the Ulster emigration to the parallels which the brightness of its progress has illumined, when considered in its magnificent bearings upon the union, and through it generally upon the world, displays the wisdom and goodness of the Divine will in their most exalted operation. The mission of this race through the land is like the march of Arcturus and Orion through the blue cope of night.

The great satisfaction we feel when surveying the prominence of the Scotch Irish race in the States is ever diminished, when we take a side-look at the pretensions of Puritanism. All the world has heard of "Forefather's day," and how each orator then of the Pilgrim stock, from the lofty stand of Webster down to the lowest rundle of the intellectual ladder, enjoys the God-like prerogative of claiming as a family work *the creation of the United States*. His arrogance meets no rebuke, for on that day he speaks *ex cathedra*, and his person is, as "Types" would say, *tabooed*. In these vauntful diatribes, constructed upon the great model given by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, the help afforded toward the formation of the Union as it is, by the Middle and Southern States, under the direction of Virginia and the great Washington, is altogether overlooked. And the *genius* of Patrick Henry, to whose electric flashes we have always felt greatly indebted for enlightening as they did the midnight pathway of the first Congress, was after all it seems as to its benefits worthless as the Jack o'lantern which beguiles the traveller in the glens of his Scottish ancestry. But who would complain? We stand upon the sunny side of our heteroscean neighbors;—we may smile at the adroitness with which they purloin the laurels that have bloomed upon the mountains of the South, where-with they embellish their festivals. It is a Spartan theft. Aye, let them year by year "take the timbrel and harp and rejoice at the sound of the organ." It is a venial sin, we think, for those who like it, to indulge like Haman in fanfaronade upon the family hearth and among their admiring kindred. But when the descendant of our Scotch Irishman stoops at the door, and begs a seat upon that hearth, then is our sense of dignity wounded. Just as if it were not enough for the vain household to respond one after another to the notable question, "Who killed cock robin?" but our kinsman must volunteer to bear testimony to the deed, after the manner represented in the second stanza

of the nursery rhyme. We can fully appreciate, with such a scene in our view, the sentiment expressed by the greatest of the Caesars when giving up the life struggle, and yielding himself to a sad sublime resignation he exclaimed, "Et tu Brute!"—or the feelings of one greater than Caesar, who is described as showing his wounds, and saying "I was wounded in the house of my friends."

Sewickley, Pa.

D. E. N.

PONTIUS PILATE.

THERE are different methods of acquiring fame or notoriety in this world. Some seek and attain earthly glory and immortality, by the splendor and extensive influence of their achievements, mental, moral or military. Others become notorious, by their association, with persons, and objects of great interest and importance. There was once a Hero who found his way to fame, by firing the temple of Diana, one of the wonders of the world. Another will be held in everlasting remembrance, for having destroyed the Alexandrian Library, far more valuable than all the temples of ancient mythology! To this latter class, belongs Pontius Pilate, the Roman Procurator, "damned to everlasting fame," from his association with his illustrious victim, the greatest and best of all beings, and the incorporation of his name into the Apostles' Creed.

Unquestionably the Biography of the Bible, as well as every other part, was written for our knowledge and edification. Yea, "all scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable" and the design of the whole is to make "the man of God, perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good word and work." The excellencies of character, portrayed in those prayers by the pen of inspiration, are designed for our imitation. And they become more imitable, by assuming the concrete form of action. On the other hand, failures and sins are designed for our warning and correction, and on the same principle are more impressive and useful, when inwrought into personal life, than when presented as abstractions. With this view, not only are good men, but bad men, introduced to our consideration, in the Bible. We have on one hand the impetuosity and imprudence of Peter, and on another the vacillation and truckling of Pontius Pilate!

We propose in this paper, to consider some of the features of

character, belonging to this notorious Personage, as developed in, or easily deducible from, the scripture narrative.

Our first remark is, that Pontius Pilate may be taken as a representative of the *average* character of thoroughly worldly men, in all ages, whether in church or state. This, probably is not the usual impression; but we can come to no other conclusion, from a careful collection of incidents of the scripture narrative, and the facts derived from the testimony of profane history. We are apt to imagine that there was something almost demoniacal in the wickedness, that could consign such a Being as the incarnate Redeemer, to the ignominious death of the cross, at the instigation of a loathsome existing Hierarchy, and notwithstanding his acknowledged innocence. In our circumstances, and with our knowledge of the true character and mission of the Messiah, this is all very natural. But the illusion vanishes, when we analyse the state of Pilate's mind, and his relations to the Jewish people and their peculiar religious economy. Pilate's point of vision, was intensely and exclusively worldly. His feelings were thoroughly contemptuous towards the whole Jewish nation, high and low alike, sunk as they were then in the lowest depths of degeneracy. The Pharisees were the very personification of formalism and sanctified hypocrisy. The Sadducees, of levity and reckless devotion to pleasure. The mystic and ascetic class of Essenes had probably never crossed the path, or awakened the curiosity, of the Procurator. In this state of things, the controversy between the Hierarchy, and the Lord Jesus Christ, would possess in his estimation nothing but a personal, or at farthest a national interest—a strife for power, where both parties in turn had courted and secured the voice of the populace. To him as Governor of Judea, under Tiberius Caesar, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," though in reality the most glorious of all beings, and engaged in the work for which, the whole theatre of the universe was originally built, was but a state criminal, to be disposed of simply on the principles of an ordinary legal transaction, or according to his own personal determinations. "Knowest thou not" says he to the Saviour, "that I have power to crucify thee or to release thee?" He was one of "the Princes of the world, that came to naught," "and knew not the Lord Jesus." From his brief personal intercourse with the Saviour, he must have been satisfied of his innocence. He must have been struck also, if not awed, by the evidences of superiority, flashing forth amidst that wonderful scene of examination. He must have felt the sublimity of his silence. He knew moreover the low and mean motives, which

actuated his enemies, and that "for envy they had delivered him." But Pontius Pilate, had probably no acquaintance with the Old Testament delineations of the expected Messiah; he had not probably been witness to any of his works or listened to any of his words; the prejudices of his understanding had never been conquered, as was the case with Christ's adversaries by a process, which inflamed more intensely the prejudices of their hearts. Pilate moved in a worldly sphere of thought altogether. He looked at persons and events, Christ and Barabbas, the crucifixion of one or the other, simply as they stood connected with the advancement of worldly interests. He had probably no personal malice towards the Saviour, and would have preferred releasing him, had such a course been for his interests. As it was he evidently tries to shift responsibility, and place it on those by whose suggestions and instigations he was at last compelled to decide!

In all this, Pilate was not, as he is often imagined and indeed represented, an isolated case of unparalleled and unapproachable depravity. He was no monster of iniquity, so exalted above other men in the hellish nature of his acts, that there is no danger or possibility now of repeating his crimes. By such an imagination, we lose all the benefits, designed to be conveyed by the record of his history and the inspired portrait of his character. Thousands, in every successive age, have been quite as bad as Pilate; public men, in every country and every century, have trod in the footsteps of this notorious predecessor and representative of dereliction of principle for popularity, of this looking at Jesus Christ, in the person of his disciples, or the principles of his cause, in the light of present interest. Every where in history, alas! in the range of observation also in our own times and in our own country, in church and state, we find men, whose governing principles, are like Pontius Pilate's—who *placed in his circumstances*, would have acted just as he did, for in analogous circumstances they were actually swayed by the same motives. In ecclesiastical assemblies, underneath the judicial ermine, in the halls of legislation, and in the high places of power, when issues have been presented to worldly men involving a choice between principle and expediency, conscience and convenience, present apparent interest, popularity, pecuniary gain, and high office, on the one hand, or ultimate honor and lasting glory on the other, they have re-enacted, in all essential particulars, the course of the wily Roman Procurator, though from infancy they may have repeated that portion of the common creed of Christendom which says—"He suffered under Pontius Pi-

late." But for the difference of effects in the one case and the other, such men would stand in the damning reprobation of all good men and all posterity in precisely the same category!

These considerations make the study of this character of value for all time, and no doubt, for this purpose, it has been recorded by the unerring wisdom of inspiration, in close association with the illustrious counterpart! It exhibits our common fallen humanity, an average character of worldliness, manifesting itself in peculiar circumstances indeed, which can never be repeated, but for our warning nevertheless. Pontius Pilate, in the history of our world, stands out eminent like a Pharos, to show public men especially where there are breakers, on which present character, and everlasting hopes, may be wrecked. It is a study eminently appropriate to all, who, from their position in church or state, are tempted to act on expediency, to aim at present popularity, or secure some temporary triumph at the expense of principle, in regard to the great interests of truth and righteousness, the prosperity of their country and the glory of God.

Our second remark is, that the character of Pontius Pilate, as developed in the scripture narrative, manifests the existence and influence of conscience, maintaining a long struggle, yet finally overpowered by the force of lower considerations. We have already stated that Pilate was, probably, ignorant of the character and claims of the Messiah, and viewed Him, as any other person brought before him for trial. Yet evidence of innocence is fully developed by the trial itself, and he solemnly and repeatedly asseverated: "I find no fault in him." His evident reluctance to condemn this obviously innocent person, indicate strongly the actings of conscience. First, he endeavors to transfer the whole case to the spiritual adjudication of the Sanhedrim, disclaiming civil jurisdiction, in a matter which involved the infraction of only ecclesiastical law. "Take him and judge him according to your law." Then, he eagerly avails himself of the plea, that he belonged to the territorial administration of Herod, waiving his prerogatives and making up a long existing feud, rather than assume responsibility. "As soon as he knew, he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod." Finally, by the impressive symbol of washing his hands, he designs to show that, in proceeding to the act of condemnation, he is impelled by the force of circumstances, not of his own convictions. He tries to make a protest to satisfy his conscience, while he surrenders the Son of God to the fury of the populace. Avowing the innocence of his victim, and conscious of the meanness of those who desired his official countenance to their iniquity, he violates

his inward sense of rectitude, under the ignoble fear of consequences and the miserable suggestions of expediency. "So Pilate willing to content the people, released Barabbas and delivered Jesus to be crucified." It is painfully interesting to watch this conflict between the higher and lower principles of man's nature, and to see which triumphs at last. So, in a multitude of similar cases we see a like result. There is a clear apprehension of right and wrong, a frank acknowledgement of an imperative rule of conduct, ordained by infinite authority and commended by infinite motives, an admission of the true glory of acting under all circumstances conformably to this acknowledged standard; yet, at the crisis, low and selfish influences of gain, popularity, present quiet, or acquiescence in surrounding numerical majorities prevail, principle is abandoned, like the Messiah by Pilate, and expediency chosen, like Barabbas by the bigotted Jewish Hierarchy! There are men, whose conscience and judgment are on the side of religion, who know and will admit that it is best and most noble, most certainly connected with present peace and final happiness to be christians, and openly and fully identified with Christ's cause and kingdom, yet because this course of evident right may involve self-denial or interfere with some chosen scheme of earthly aggrandizement, they will continue, for years, possibly to the close of life, in an attitude which conscience condemns, and by which the noble consciousness of rectitude, and all the elements of true greatness, are finally destroyed. There have been men, who have inwardly felt and even publicly avowed for example, their convictions of the wickedness of duelling—that the practice was contrary to the law of God, and their own sense of moral rectitude. Yet these very men, when insulted or challenged, have succumbed to the pressure of a perverted public opinion, and while making a protest, like Pilate, have sanctioned by bloody sacrifices, their own or of others, the misnamed code of honor. They were cowards to avoid the reproach of cowardice, choosing to *seem* rather than *to be* courageous. What an affecting illustration of this conflict is afforded by the case of Alexander Hamilton, one of the brightest names in American history, who for his years had few superiors in any age or country. It is most painful to read the protest he penned, just before he went out to the fatal field, and which was found among his papers after his death. He washed his hands deliberately of the guilt of premeditated murder, by proposing not to fire, and yet yielded himself up a martyr to a Juggernaut whose frowns he could not brave. So in other cases, involving the antagonism of the higher principles of conscience

and accountability to God, and the lower principles of expediency and the fear of man or of present disgrace, we find re-enacted the scene, where Pilate and Barabbas and the Son of God were prominent ! Truth and conscience, led away to be crucified, and the robber, guilty of nameless crimes, released.

All such, men in high places especially, cowards in religion and base worshippers of public opinion, should study the recorded portrait of Pontius Pilate, and before they pronounce him a weathercock or monster of wickedness, see whether they are not in their sphere, as weak and wicked as he was.

Once more, a special characteristic of Pontius Pilate, developed, in the scripture narrative, is that he violated conscience and condemned the innocent, for fear of losing office with its connected honors and emoluments. Decisive influence, in the long conflict between conscience and expediency in his bosom, was exerted by the ingenious suggestion : " If thou let this man go, thou art no friend of Caesar—Who ever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar." There was magic, to the sensibilities of Pilate, in the mention of that name, embodying the might and majesty of Roman power in the person of its Emperor. Caesar was the centre of patronage, the sun around which the satellites of the mighty system of the Roman Empire, to its widest circumference, then revolved, and separated from which they were lost. To Pilate, who identified, as worldlings usually do, glory with civil advancement and the frown of the court with political death, this suggestion presented an overwhelming difficulty. Could right be done and office retained, the innocent spared and the good esteem of the sovereign and patronage of the influential at the same time secured, his course would have been plain. But, he must choose between these two irreconcilable courses ; either venture on danger and political death, in the discharge of duty, or retain office, honor and emolument, by doing wrong. In this dilemma, he falters, trifles with the first dictates of the inward monitor, usually most distinct and accurate, and finally yields to the popular clamor and the pressure of political ambition, as multitudes in every age have done, when placed in a similar predicament.

Oh ! how often since the age of Pontius Pilate, and notwithstanding the plain lesson of his history, have analogous influences produced similar results, with the time serving votaries of popularity, the ambitious aspirants of office, or the cowardly worshippers of numerical majorities ! !

The price or prospect, by which the power of conscience is torqued or suspended, varies in different individuals and periods.

Sometimes it is high office in the state, and again the high places of ecclesiastical power. To one man, it is a commanding position in a political party, to another, "to be called of men Rabbi, and to have the chief seat in the synagogue." Some are swerved into tangent or tortuous courses, by the presence and interposition of only a large attracting body, their conscience being large and massive. Others, whose moral gravity is inconsiderable, may be deflected from the right orbit by means amazingly small. As the Deceiver once said to the Saviour, after shewing him "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," the mightiest attraction ever presented to the ambition of the heart, "All this will I give thee," so suiting the power to the resistance to be overcome, he says to the vacillating conscience and the excited aspiration, "All this, will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me," and relinquish right, God's approbation and thine own! On the other hand, says the wily tempter: "If you do this, though it is right, and you will meet the cravings of what men called conscience, you will always be poor"—"You can never secure or exert any large influence"—"As the world goes, success is the criterion of excellence and you are doomed, if you allow your chivalrous sense of honor or the fictions of the moral sense to sway you, to be identified with the crushed party; and then, farewell to the glory and emolument of high and honorable elevation." There have been men, who under these influences have deliberately changed sides in politics or religion, and adjusted themselves without special inconvenience to their new position, though it involved a practical oblivion of all their previous thinking, speaking, and acting. I heard once of a Physician, who subscribed a new creed of politics in a single night, from the promise of the special patronage of the party, and who became "rich and increased in goods" from that crisis, and of another, who refused the same offer, from the same source, and who maintained afterwards a long and manly fight with poverty, upheld and cheered by a good conscience. No doubt, the clerical profession, if we were fond of rioting in the garbage of fallen humanity would furnish similar sickening illustrations. Many a Pontius Pilate, since the crucifixion of Christ, has delivered up the noblest attribute of humanity, under such suggestions, to be crucified; and as a righteous consequence, in God's retributive arrangements, has been doomed to lose, both the happiness of an approving conscience, and the very honors and emoluments for the sake of which he consented to become morally humiliated! Oh! it is a glorious thing, though rare, to see a man, of "like passions with

others," willing and purposed to do right, regardless of present consequences, nobly heedless of popular clamor, or court favor, contented in the consciousness of consistent rectitude, as the crushed hero on the field of Pavia, to lose every thing but honor; preferring the smile of God to the smile or sunshine of Caesar. In the great crisis of a country, a church or a race, these are the men "whose price is above rubies." Their position, in proportion to its perils and temptations, Posterity will approve, if a contemporary and perverted generation should condemn. Such a man was Andrew Marvel, in the corrupt age of Charles II; and such a hero was Marion, in the midnight of the Revolution! Such principled heroes, however, counter parts of Pontius Pilate in every point, are not formed on worldly maxims of carnal policy. The recognition of a higher power—an omniscient God—assimilation to a nobler model, even the mind of Christ, the sweet consciousness of a better inheritance and an amaranthine crown, and a steadfast appeal to an impartial final tribunal, are the elements, which enter into the composition of such a character. Against a man, entrenched in such fortresses the weapons of carnal expediency, wielded ever by Satanic cunning have no power.

" Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus instantis tyranni,
Mente quatit solidâ."

The all-sufficing reply to all suggestions of temporizing, or tortuous policy, all appeals addressed to ambition and vain glory, is compressed in words of this kind: "How can I do this thing, and sin against God?"—"Thou God seest me!"—"Get thee behind me Satan." These are the shields of imperilled virtue, the talismans of its triumph. "As ever in the great Taskmaster's eye," such a man will do right, even at the loss of all things, nor do conscious wrong, were the whole world, and the kingdoms and the glory of it, conveyed to him, in fee simple, from its present usurped Proprietor!

Well were it for our country and our race, if the men to whom its guidance is committed, and by whose agency its destiny is influenced, were always men of this high moral stamp, and if no successors of Pontius Pilate were found in the Legislative, Judicial and Executive departments of influence in our world! Well—it is vain, simply to wish; it is not enough merely to say, that such may be the case. Every man, especially every christian man, is responsible to the extent of his influence, in all his relations, for shaping such a state of political morals, as will

make it the *interest* of all men, everywhere, to do right, even if higher motives are inoperative. Every christian, is at least obligated, when occasion is afforded on a lower or higher scale, to exhibit a personal exemplification of a character, in every aspect the moral antithesis of Pontius Pilate's! Christianity is designed, not only to qualify men for citizenship in glory after leaving "this present evil world," but to make them "the Light of the world and the Salt of the Earth," in their present intermistic relations. Other countries have failed in their struggles for inalienable rights, because, amidst the wild tempests of revolutionary fury, there was not enough of principled christianity infused and living, to counteract the violence of depraved passions or the meanness of personal aggrandizement. If ever our country perishes, which may Heaven in mercy forbid, not indeed as a succession of individuals, but for all the high purposes of a nation, it will be because the representatives of Pontius Pilate, men who prefer Barabbas to Jesus Christ, if such a course will subserve their sinister purposes, are placed in power, in the misguided exercise of our elective franchises!

Finally, the subsequent history and terrible catastrophe of Pilate's life, is fraught with warning and instruction. Authentic history informs us, that shortly afterwards he was superseded in office, accused before the Emperor, and banished to a distant part of the Empire, where he perished at length by his own hand! Such was "the end of Earth" to Pontius Pilate, who condemned "the Just one." A wild Irish legend tells us, that *Ireland*, was the place of his banishment, and one of its dreariest mountain deserts the theatre of his miserable and unsolaced suicide! The legend, goes on to say, that he is doomed to wander over the earth, a disturbed spirit to this hour. Enough is known to prove, that in his case "vaulting ambition, o'er leapt itself, and fell on t'other side." That, for which he surrendered truth and conscience, he after all failed to secure, he lived disappointed, died in despair, and is now and will forever be, in some world, reaping the bitter fruits of his earthly career.

An instructive picture is here presented to the men, who in any age, and for any consideration, crucify the Son of God afresh, or go against conscience, to secure some temporal interest or please some regnant party in church or state! Oh! how emphatically cheerless the old age, and grand climacteric of a worldling, who sold his conscience and was after all cheated of the promised reward. After the fever and strife of busy life is over, how pitiable is it, to have no good conscience to sustain, amidst the withering of earthly expectations, and the infirmities

and infelicitities incident to old age under the most favorable circumstances. With no pleasing recollections of the past, and a fearful looking for of future and eternal gloom, how terrible the final struggle with "the king of terrors." Even the legendary punishment, to which Irish superstition consigns the legal Destroyer of the Son of God, is a faint picture of the actual doom of all, in after ages, that follow in his footsteps. Condemned, to wander, "in the blackness of darkness," while cycles of ages, are rolling away, with a distinct consciousness of the past, a vivid sense of the present, and fearful anticipation of the future! "Better for that man, that he had never been born," a deeper damnation than Pilate's, on the principle announced by the Saviour, will belong to those, who, in our day, and with all the light now enjoyed, consent for paltry gain, or present popularity or fleeting pleasure, to crucify their consciences, sell their souls and abandon their Saviour. Halts between two opinions, palterers with principle, captives of Satan, deluded votaries, of a world passing away and perishing! Yet even such need not despair, and will not perish, if they do not persevere. Even for Pontius Pilate there would have been mercy and merit enough, had he repented and believed! For the murderers of Christ, who imprecated his blood on themselves and their children, that blood would have availed for pardon and cleansing. "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." For the vilest and guiltiest there are provisions and proffers of pardon, and there is no absolute necessity now that any should perish, provided, they do not procrastinate too long, or finally grieve away "the Holy Spirit, by which we are sealed to the day of redemption."

Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. H. R.

THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL.

[Translated from Schaff's Church History, by T. C. PORTER.]

WE enter now on the history of one, who, as a thinker, is no whit inferior to the most profound philosophers, or, as a hero, to the greatest conquerors of the world, while, as a man, he towers far above them all,—who, as a Christian, by his activity, yea, by his mere conversion, bears more powerful witness to the divinity of the Gospel than whole volumes of scientific argument,—who, as an apostle, unfolds, in by far the most spirited and weighty manner, the peculiarity and catholicity of the Christian religion, as the absolute world-religion, the deliverance of which from the fetters of Judaism and its victory over heathenism had been by him chiefly determined,—who, finally, as a benefactor of mankind, is entitled to the next place after the Saviour of us all, in whose humble service and true fellowship even he found his highest glory and his purest joy.

Saul (after the Hebrew), or *Paul* (after the Hellenistic form)¹

¹ It was a custom of the Jews to have two names, and, in their intercourse with foreigners, to use one either from the Latin, or the Greek, e. g. John, Marcus (Acts xii: 12, 15), Simeon, Niger (xiii, 1), Jesus, Justus (Col. iv, 11). This best explains why the name Paul, appears immediately from that point of time, when he comes forth as the independent apostle of the Gentiles, whilst before and in the first period after his conversion, where Luke followed Palestinian documents, he goes by the name of Saul. But probably he had already used the Græco-Roman form, during his earlier residence in Tarsus. From the more ancient view of *Jerome* (de vir. illus. c. 5), which has lately been defended by *Olshausen* and *Meyer*, that Paul assumed this name in thankful remembrance of the first-fruits of his apostolic ministry, the conversion of the Roman Proconsul, *Sergius Paulus* (Acts xiii, 7), (apostolus a primo ecclesiæ spolio, Proconsule Sergio Paulo, victoriæ suæ trophæa retulit. erexitque vexillum, ut Paulus ex Saulo vocaretur), we must dissent for the following reasons: 1. The new name appears before the conversion of *Sergius*, namely, in Acts xiii, 9, whilst one should wait for its first assumption till c. xiii, 13, to which *Fritzsche* has justly called attention (Epist. P. ad Roman. tom. 1, p. xi, note 2). 2. It was indeed the usage of antiquity, to name the scholar after the teacher, but never the reverse (see *Neander Apostel gesch.* 1, p. 135, note). 3. Paul had doubtless before this converted many heathens, even if it be not expressly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (comp. nevertheless xi, 25–26), since almost nothing is said of his three years' sojourn in Arabia, and his abode in Tarsus is but briefly alluded to. At all events, there is no conceivable reason why the conversion of this proconsul should seem to the apostle worthy of commemoration by a change of name.—In homiletic and practical discourses, it is still usual to refer the double name of the apostle to the great religious contrast of his life, just as the new name of Simon dates

was descended from Jewish ancestors, of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. iii: 5, 2 Cor. xi: 22), and born a Roman citizen (Acts xxii: 28, xvi: 37), probably only a few years after the birth of Christ,* at Tarsus, the capitol of Cilicia in Asia Minor, and a celebrated seat of Grecian culture* (ix: 11, xxi: 39, xxii: 3). Although set apart for a theologian, he yet learned, according to Jewish custom, a trade, that of tent-making,* by which, when an apostle, with noble self-sacrifice, he for the most part earned his own living, so as to maintain his independence and avoid being burdensome to the churches.* In his birth-place he enjoyed an excellent opportunity of making himself early acquainted with the Greek language and nationality, which proved of great moment in his subsequent career. And yet, it is not at all likely, that he there received a proper classical training, since the Jewish educational element largely predominates in his writings. He quotes, indeed, several passages from the heathen poets, from *Aratus* (Acts xvii: 28), from *Menander* (1 Cor. xv:

itself from his confession of the Messiahship of Jesus, and by its meaning indicates his importance in the history of the church. So, for example, *Augustine* (Serm. 315) draws a parallel between Saul, the persecutor of the Christians, and the persecutor of David (Saulus enim nomen est a *Saul*, Saul persecutor erat regis David. Talis fuerat Saul in David, qualis Saulus in Stephanum,) and finds in the new name, which he derives from the Latin adjective, paulus, the idea of humility (quia Paulus modicus est, Paulus parvus est. Nos solemus sic loqui: videbo te post paulum, i. e. post modicum. Unde ergo Paulus: "ego sum minimus Apostolorum" 1 Cor. xv, 9). Still more capricious and ungrammatical is the play, referred to by *Chrysostom* (de nominum mutatione), but at the same time decidedly rejected by him, which makes Saul come from σαλεύειν sc. ἐκκλησιαν, and Paul from πάρασθαι sc. τὸν διώκειν, so that the first name shall denote the persecution of the Christians and the second its cessation!! Now Saul is confessedly a Hebrew word and means rather, *the longed for, the prayed for*. All these and similar allegorical interpretations are effectually cut off by the fact that Paul, after his conversion, frequently receives from Luke the name of Saul Acts ix: 8, 11, 17, 19, 22, 26, xi: 25, 30, xii: 25, xiii: 2, 9.).

* Because when the Epistle to Philemon was written, about the year 63, at the time of his imprisonment in Rome (v. 9), he was an old man, *πρεσβυτης*, perhaps over sixty.

* *Strabo*, the contemporary of Augustus Cæsar, in his Geography xiv, 6, places Tarsus, as to philosophy and literature, even before Athens and Alexandria.

* Tents were anciently used in various ways, in war, in navigation, by shepherds and travellers, and were mostly made of goat's hair, which in Cilicia was particularly coarse and well suited for this purpose (hence *καλίκιος τράγος*, also signified, a rough man). Comp. Hug. Einl. in's N. T. II, p. 328, 3d ed.

* Only from the Christians in Philippi, with whom he stood connected by ties of peculiar friendship, did he accept presents, Phil. iv: 15.

33), and from *Epimenides* (Tit. i: 12). But these quotations might have been picked up, during his later intercourse with the Greeks, or from occasional reading, which must be carefully distinguished from a regular classical education. His deep insight into the essence and development of heathen philosophy and religion, as seen in the Epistle to the Romans and the first Epistle to the Corinthians, may be readily explained on the score of spiritual illumination and extraordinary knowledge of the human heart.¹ Be this as it may, he was sent by his parents, if not when a boy, yet when quite a youth, to Jerusalem, and placed in the school of a wise and learned Pharisee, the celebrated *Gamaliel* (Acts xxii: 3, xxvi: 4, 5), who stood in high repute with the nation (v: 34) and, according to the Talmud, was styled, "The glory of the Law."

Gifted with eminent talents, with creative genius and a rare keenness and energy of intellect, he made himself master of the whole round of Rabbinical learning, which included jurisprudence, as well as theology, and the various modes of interpreting the Bible, allegory, typology, and tradition, as his epistles abundantly shew. By means of this theoretical discipline he was enabled to refute with such wonderful skill the errors of the Pharisees, and, above all the other apostles, to unfold the doctrinal contents of Christianity, in a solid and complete manner. Endowed by nature with an impetuous, resolute character, with the temperament of a religious reformer, the cholero-melancholic, he laid hold of whatever once seemed to him right with all his soul, but for this very reason was prone also to run into harshness and extremes. He was, therefore, a Pharisee of the severest order and a blind zealot for the traditions of the fathers (Phil. iii: 6, Gal. i: 14). Yet he must have belonged to the most earnest and noble of this sect, who in no wise consisted of mere hypocrites, since we find among them a Nicodemus, a Joseph of Arimathea, and a Gamaliel. After the ideal of Jewish piety, as he then conceived it, he aspired with honest sincerity, and hence, when a Christian, he sharply condemned his persecution of the

¹ It is possible, certainly, that Paul, at a later period, had studied classic authors, either in the school of Gamaliel, who himself was not averse to Grecian culture, or on his missionary tours, as e. g. *Tholurk* supposes (*Vermischte Schriften*, Th. II, 839, p. 275; also Hug, l. c. p. 330); only this cannot be proved from these few quotations, while, if his bigotted Judaism before, and his immense ministerial activity after his conversion, which occupied all his time, be taken into consideration, the opposite opinion is more probable.

church, hence, his deep sorrow on looking back over his former fanaticism, hence he added that it was done "ignorantly" (1 Tim. i: 13), without thereby wishing to extenuate his guilt. Well might he, in his eager pursuit of the more perfect righteousness of the Law, oftentimes feel the conflict in his members, which he has so vividly and faithfully pictured in Rom. ch. 7. These internal struggles no doubt fitted him, after he had attained to the righteousness which is by faith, to exhibit so fully the relation of the Gospel to the Law, man's utter need of salvation, the emptiness of all natural righteousness, and the power of faith in the only Saviour.

At first, Saul might have overlooked Christianity as an altogether insignificant phenomenon,¹ but as soon as it came forth into open conflict with Pharisaism, as first happened in the person of *Stephen*, it must then have appeared to him, in his gloomy fanaticism, as a despising of the law of the fathers, as a rebellion against the authority of Jehovah, and he, therefore, regarded the uprooting of the new sect as a conscientious duty and a work well-pleasing to God. Hence the active part, which, he, yet a young man scarce thirty years of age, took in the murder of *Stephen*, and the persecution following. He broke into houses to hunt up Christians. He dragged forth men and women to deliver them over to judgment and cast them into prison (Acts viii: 3, 4, xxii: 4). Not content with this, "still breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," he applied to the high-priest, who was the president of the Sanhedrim, which had the superintendence of all the synagogues and could alone decree the punishment due to despisers of the law, and obtained from him a warrant to arrest all Christians. Armed therewith, he betook himself to the Syrian city of Damascus (ix: 1, on, comp. xxii: 5), whither multitudes had fled and where the Jews had many synagogues.² But here the gracious hand of Him, whom he persecuted, was stretched forth, to save and change his whole life: the height of apostasy was to him the crisis of redemption.

On the way to Damascus happened that miracle of grace,

¹ It is possible, that he knew Jesus himself, but not probable, since no clear evidence of it is found in his writings. From the passage 2-Cor. v: 16, we can by no means infer it with the same confidence, as *Olshausen* does, comp. *Neander* Apostelgesch. I, p. 142.

² *Josephus* de bello Jud. II, 20, 2, narrates, that under Nero nearly all the women of Damascus were converts to Judaism, and that ten thousand Jews were executed at one time.

which transformed the raging Saul into a praying Paul, the self-righteous Pharisee into an humble Christian, the most dangerous enemy of the church into her most energetic apostle, and sanctified the rich endowments of his nature to the service of the Redeemer. Paul himself in his letters, when handling his Judaistic opposers, more than once appeals to this striking event, as a voucher to his apostolic call, without alluding to the detail, which was well known to the believers to whom he wrote. In the Epistle to the Galatians he asserts with special emphasis, that he was called to be an apostle, not by man, as perchance Matthias, who was chosen by lot to fill the place of Judas, but directly by Christ himself (ch. i: 1), and that he had received his Gospel, to preach it to the heathen, not from human teaching, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ (11-16). With this also agrees 2 Cor. 4: 6, where he ascribes his knowledge to a creative act of God, which he compares to the calling forth of the natural light out of the darkness of chaos. Whether the illumination was merely inward or at the same time accompanied by an external appearance cannot be determined from these passages. But on the other hand, he declares plainly, in 1 Cor. ix: 1, that he "had seen Jesus Christ, the Lord." That he means by this, a real objective appearance is clear from 1 Cor. xv: 8, where he classes it with the other appearances of the risen Lord to his disciples: "Last of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

In the Acts of the Apostles we find three accounts of the nature and manner of his conversion, one from the pen of Luke, ch. ix: 1-19, and two from the mouth of Paul, the first in his speech to the Jewish nation at Jerusalem, ch. xxii: 3-16, the second in his defence before king Agrippa and the procurator Festus during the imprisonment at Cesarea, ch. xxvi: 9-20. They all agree in the main fact, that the conversion was wrought by Christ in his own person. Thus, when Paul drew near to Damascus, suddenly, an extraordinary light from heaven, above the brightness of the mid-day sun, shone around him and his companions (xxvi: 13), in which flood of beams he beheld the glorified Saviour (ix: 17, 27, comp. 1 Cor. ix: 1, and xv: 8) and heard his voice speak to him in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." Saul, struck to the earth by the over-

¹ This customary mode of speaking to oxen and horses: *πρὸς κίνητρα λατρί-
σας*, *adversus stimulum calcare*, to kick against the driving goad, can either

whelming power of this appearance, put the question, "Who art thou, Lord?" to which the Saviour answered, He, who looks on every persecution of his disciples, by reason of their life-union with him, as a persecution of himself: "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; but arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee, what thou must do." When Saul rose up, he saw no one. The supernatural splendor had blinded his eyes. That light, in which hitherto he had fancied himself able to lead all others, was extinguished. As a child, he suffered himself to be led to Damascus, where he remained blind and fasting for the space of three days, in solemn thought and humble prayer for the higher light of grace and of faith. Amid these birth-throes of the new life, he no doubt felt the whole misery of the natural man, the intolerable bondage of the legal standpoint, and in the anguish of his soul cried out: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death (Rom. vii: 23)?" After being thus prepared by "godly sorrow," he was assured within of approaching help and directed by a vision to the man, who would become an instrument to heal both body and soul and bring him into fraternal union with the church. Ananias, an esteemed disciple of Damascus, whom the Lord had prepared by a vision, as he had Peter, at the conversion of Cornelius, bestowed on the praying Saul, through the laying on of hands, his earthly sight, baptism for the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, and made known to him the divine call, that he, as a chosen vessel, should bear to Jews and Gentiles the name of Jesus Christ and by many sufferings for his name become highly honored.¹

denote the subjective impossibility of resistance to the power of divine grace, and furnish, in the view, an argument for the Augustinian doctrine of *gratia irresistibilis*; or, which seems to us more probable, can express the objective fruitlessness of opposition to the church of Christ, founded on an immovable rock. This interpretation is strengthened by the parallel in the speech of Gamaliel, ch. v: 39: "but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

¹The acknowledged differences, found in the three accounts, on which Baur in his work on Paul p.60, sqq., has laid undue stress, in behalf of his mythical interpretation, concern merely unimportant accessory circumstances, and to every unprejudiced mind serve only to confirm belief and overthrow the hypothesis of subsequent design and calculating reflection on the part of the author of the Acts of the Apostles. 1. In Acts ix, 7, the companions of Paul are said to hear the voice speaking to him, but in xxii, 9, not. This apparent contradiction may be reconciled by simply supposing that his fellow-travellers perceived the sound of the voice, but could not distinguish the articulated words, which were intended for the ear of Saul

Though we turn our eyes away from those theories of this change so fruitful in grand results, which place themselves beyond the stand-point of biblical Christianity, yet the question arises,¹ whether, along with a full recognition of the historical occurrence and of the divine factor, a psychological preparation in the spirit of Paul may not be admitted, since God never works upon man in a magical way. In support of this view we are referred particularly to the echo of the wise counsel of his teacher Gamaliel (Acts v: 38, 39), and to the impression, which the

alone. 2. In xxii, 9, (comp. xxvi, 13) his companions are said to see the light beaming around Paul, but in ix. 7, to see no one (*μηδεν*), i. e. no clearly defined form in the blaze of light, which does not in the least conflict with the first representation. 3. In xxvi, 16-18, Jesus himself is said to make known to Paul his being chosen an apostle, whilst this according to both the other accounts, happened through the mediation of Ananias. It may be explained thus, that Paul before Agrippa condensed the narrative for the sake of brevity. And the first representation also is in no wise incorrect, since the communication of Ananias happened at the command of the Lord, and Paul was already directed to it on his way to Damascus (ix. 6).

¹Here belongs the oft-exploded rationalistic interpretation of *Ammon*, among others, which, wholly against the clear meaning of the text, reduces the supernatural splendor of the glorified God-man to a flash of lightning and the voice speaking in the *Hebrew* tongue to a peal of thunder, and in the rest sees only the additions of a heated oriental fancy. But no whit better is the mythical theory, lately defended by Dr. *Baur*, according to which we have here before us no real objective appearance, either natural or supernatural, but merely a subjective transaction, a psychological process. "That light," says *Baur*, "is nothing else than the symbolical or mythical expression of the certainty of the real and immediate presence of Jesus glorified in heaven" (Paulus p. 68). This view does not rest on historical grounds, but on unproven philosophical assumptions, e. g. on the impossibility of miracles, especially on the denial of the resurrection of Christ, and degrades moreover Paul, that clear, strenuously logical and keenly penetrating spirit into a blind and stubborn fanatic. For *Baur* cannot deny that Paul, apart from the accounts in the Acts of the Apostles, believed himself, according to 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv, 18, truly to have seen the Lord, and that the resurrection of Christ was esteemed by him as the most credible and important of all facts, yea, that he declared his preaching and entire faith vain and groundless without it, and Christians "of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. xv, 14-19). Which is more reasonable, to give full credence to the plain statement of such a man, confirmed as it is by the most glorious results, and correct our own philosophy from the history, where they come into collision. or to deny the reality of this fact, and for the sake of certain preconceived opinions, to trace back to a vain image of the brain, to a radical self-delusion, that life the most rich in deeds and full of blessing which history can furnish next to the life of the blessed Saviour, a life, that has already afforded to millions daily instruction, strength and comfort? To decide this we need not appeal to learning and criticism, but simply to the common sense of every candid reader.

discourse and the glorified martyr's form of Stephen and of other persecuted Christians must have made upon him, an impression, of which he immediately strove to rid himself by more violent persecution. But of such preparations just as little trace can be discovered in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul, as of thunder and lightning. Nor are they very probable in view of the energetic and resolute character of the Apostle, who, in his zeal for the law, was firmly persuaded that by the persecution of Christians he did God service and wrought out the salvation of his own soul, and who could only be converted suddenly, or not at all. Over such natures, the Spirit of God comes in earthquake, fire and storm, and not in still, soft whispers. The very suddenness of his transition from bigotted Judaism to the inspired faith of the Son of God reveals to us the peculiarity of his position as Apostle of the Gentiles and representative of the most free and evangelical conception of christianity. And yet, on the other hand, it is true, that his faith in the revelation of the Old Testament, the earnestness of his will, and his honest, though at the same time mistaken, struggle after the honor of God and after righteousness formed an excellent ground-work for the operation of divine grace. For had he not persecuted the christians from ignorance (as he himself says, Tim. i: 13), but out of wanton malignity, as a Nero, had he been a frivolous man of the world, as Caiaphas and Herod, or a hypocrite, as Judas, then would no appearance from the world of spirits have ever been able to convert him (comp. Luke xvi: 31).

But in what relation did Paul stand to the original circle of the Apostles? The fact, that he was called directly by Christ, without human intervention, and could bear testimony, as an eye-witness, to the resurrection of the Lord, as well as the glorious fruit of his labors, sets his apostolic dignity beyond all dispute. And yet on this account we must either pronounce the election of Matthias to fill the place of the traitor (Acts i: 15, sqq.), void, or let go the necessity and symbolical signification of the number twelve. The latter cannot well be done, since Christ has given it special prominence (Matt xix: 28, and Luke xxii: 30), and only twelve "Apostles of the Lamb" are mentioned in the Apocalypse (xxi: 14). Some suppose the number twelve refers only to the Apostles of the Jews, and that Paul, as the thirteenth, should be considered the independent Apostle of the heathen world.¹ But this is not altogether satisfactory,

¹ As Olshausen particularly assumes, in vol. III, of his Commentary p. 8.

because Paul, on the one hand, labored partly among the Jews, and Peter and John, on the other, at a later period, among the Gentiles also, and because even in that case Paul would be passed over with strange neglect in the passage just quoted. Moreover the twelve tribes of Israel are the type, not merely of a part, but of the whole christian church. Rather can we bring ourselves to see in the election of Matthias an act unauthorized, though well-meant. The following considerations seem to favor this supposition: 1. That the election took place before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, hence, before the formal inspiration of the Apostles; 2. That it was brought about by the suggestion of Peter and through human mediation without an express command of Christ; 3. That the name of Matthias is never mentioned afterwards, whilst Paul, an instrument called directly by the Lord himself without the knowledge or concurrence of the disciples, has accomplished more than all the rest of the Apostles (2 Cor. xi: 23, 1 Cor. xv: 10).⁴ Be it as it may, it must be admitted, that the whole manner of his call, his position and his ministry, have something in them extraordinary, that will not suffer them to be included in the mechanism of a fixed order.⁵ And hence he is ever regarded as the chief authority and representative of the free movements of the Spirit in the churches.

With respect to the chronology, among the different periods fixed upon for the conversion of Paul, which differ about a de-cennium (from a. 31, as *Bengel*, to a. 41, as *Wurm* supposes), that appears to us best, which places this event in the year 37, thus, seven years after the resurrection of Christ.⁶

sqq. A peculiar modification of this opinion Dr. *Henry Thiersch* takes occasion to bring forward in behalf of Irvingism, which confessedly teaches a revival of the apostolic office for the last times. "Paul is not the thirteenth of the first apostolate, but the first of the second apostolate, which, instituted for the heathen world and the church forming herself out of it, in those ages did not yet come fully into view" (Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism, Vol. I, p. 309, vid. 2d ed.).

⁴ If Judas, the traitor, did not possess the talents of a Paul, he was yet designed for great things, else Jesus would not have received him into the number of the disciples. The greatness of his original destination may be inferred from his tragic end, just as the grandeur of a destroyed building may be gathered from its ruins. On this, compare my tract on the Sin against the Holy Ghost. 1841, p. 41 sqq.

⁵ According to the rigid hierarchical view, whether Romish or Puseyistic, the entire non-participation of the apostles, for example, in the ordination of Paul, after his conversion, (Acts ix: 17), and at the time he was sent to the heathen by the congregation of Antioch, (xiii: 3), cannot be satisfactorily explained.

⁶ And these are our reasons:—1. The statement of Paul, that, three years

after his conversion, he fled from Damascus before the ethnarch of king Aretas, 2 Cor. ii: 32, 33, leads to no fixed terms, because our knowledge of the time of this Aretas and of the history of Damascus is too uncertain. Only this much is clear, that the conversion of the apostle cannot be placed earlier, than a. 34, for Aretas could not well come into possession of the city before the death of Tiberius, a. 37, (on this, comp. *Wieseler*, l c. p. 167 175). 2. The conversion must have followed not long after the martyrdom of Stephen, which, on account of the tumultuary nature of the proceeding, is best referred to the period just succeeding the deposition of Pilate a. 36, or the beginning of the reign of Caligula (after 37), who in the first year behaved himself kindly toward his subjects, as *Josephus* expressly remarks, *Antiq.* XVIII, 8, 2. 3. A more settled starting-point is afforded by the second journey of Paul to Jerusalem (Acts xi: 29, 30), which could not have happened long before the year 45, because in this year the famine broke out in Palestine, which occasioned the sending of Paul and Barnabas with supplies. Between this and the first mentioned journey of Paul to Jerusalem, Acts ix: 26, about four or five years must intervene, since the apostle had spent, in the meanwhile, a whole year in Antioch (Acts xi: 26) and probably two or three years in Syria and in Tarsus (ix, 30, Gal. i, 21) and some time also in his travels. Now, if the first journey was made in the year 40, the year of the conversion is easily determined, because this took place, according to the statement in Gal. i, 18, three years before, hence in a. 37. But then again our confidence in this calculation is weakened by the fact that neither Luke nor Paul specifies the exact duration of his stay in Tarsus, and conjectures here differ, for whilst *Anger*, for example, allows two years, *Schrader* and *Wieseler*, on the other hand count only half a year. 4. The surest determination of the time seems to lead to the period referred to in Gal. ii: 1, where the apostle says, "fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem." If then, with the majority of interpreters, we begin to count from the conversion as the starting-point, and understand by the journey here mentioned, that to the convention of the apostles (Acts xv), which, according to a reckoning tolerably certain, happened in the year 50 or 51, we reach once more the year 37 as the latest limit for his conversion. But it must be confessed that this calculation can also be rendered doubtful, so long as chronology and exegesis differ so much as to whether we should date the fourteen years from the conversion, or from the first journey to Jerusalem, as well as to whether we should understand by the journey mentioned in Gal. ii, 1, the second (Acts xi, 30, xii, 25) or the third (xv), or the fourth (xviii, 21, 22). *Wieseler*, for example, endeavors to prove that Paul, in Gal. ii, had in his eye his *fourth* journey to Jerusalem (Acts xviii, 22), and because he places this in the year 54, he obtains, after deducting fourteen years, in agreement with his other combinations, the year 40 as the year in which the apostle was converted. But then it is very difficult for us to admit, that Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, has passed over in complete silence the journey to the convention of the Apostles, when the point of dispute settled in Gal. ii, is so closely connected with it. This is the point in which we must decidedly dissent from the chronological system of this able divine, which we in other respects consider the best and most satisfactory, particularly as regards the life of St. Paul.

LIFE OF THE REV. DR. MAYER.

LEWIS MAYER was born at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on the 26th of March, 1783. His father was GEORGE L. MAYER, of that place, a gentleman of liberal education. He was one of several children by a second marriage. His brother, Colonel GEORGE MAYER, is the only one still living, and is one of the oldest and most respectable merchants in Lancaster.

MR. MAYER'S early education was received at Lancaster, the place of his birth, partly under the direction of his father. He applied himself very closely to his studies in general, but gave particular attention to the study of the German language and some eminent German authors. After receiving a respectable German and English education at Lancaster, he determined to leave the place of his birth, and locate in Fredericktown, Maryland. In this place, he engaged for a short time in a secular calling; but having a taste much better suited to *books* than *business*, he did not succeed to any considerable extent. His mind was chiefly occupied with reading and study, and it was thus engaged when he was awakened under the preaching of the pious and excellent WAGNER, then pastor of the Reformed Church at Frederick. His convictions of sin were unusually deep and pungent. He clearly saw his lost and helpless condition as a sinner, and felt himself exposed to the awful wrath of God. He was completely overwhelmed with a sense of sin, and could find no peace, day nor night. The season through which he passed before he could exercise faith and hope in the Redeemer as *his* Redeemer, was indeed one of fearful darkness. He stood, at times, on the very borders of despair, and almost gave himself up as lost. But having been once brought out of darkness into the sweet light of the gospel, and having been led by the Spirit to hope and trust in Christ as *his* Saviour, he soon became a firmly established Christian, and found his chief delight in looking to the Redeemer, and in being engaged in his service. He has often spoken to the writer and others, with great pleasure and interest, of the kind and valuable services rendered him by father WAGNER, in his deep spiritual conflicts, and in preparing him for the high and holy work of the Christian ministry.

Not long after his conversion, MR. MAYER'S mind was impressed with the idea that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, but some considerable time elapsed before he became

fully satisfied that God had indeed called him to the ministry of reconciliation. And this assurance of a divine call to the Christian ministry was not obtained without another painful struggle. He had conflict after conflict, and it was only after great deliberation and much earnest prayer, that his mind rested in a calm and full persuasion that he was called of God to be an ambassador for Christ.

Possessing a high order of native talent, and a mind already accustomed to deep thought and earnest inquiry, he made easy and rapid progress in all his classical and theological studies; and, having completed the prescribed course of study, he was licensed, in 1807, (being then in his twenty-fourth year,) by the Reformed Synod, which met that year at New Holland, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, to preach the gospel. His classical studies were mainly pursued under the direction of the principal of Fredericktown College, and his preparation for the ministry was made under the tuition of the Rev. Mr. WAGNER, Reformed pastor at Frederick; and of this learned and excellent father, who has long since rested from his labors, he always spoke in terms of very high regard and sincere affection. How, or where, Mr. MAYER spent the first year after his licensure, is not exactly known; but it is believed that he was employed in preaching occasionally at Frederick, and some other places in the vicinity.

In 1808, he accepted a call from the Shepherdstown charge, which at that time was composed of the Shepherdstown, Martinsburg, and Smithfield congregations. In this wide and interesting field, he labored, with great acceptance and success, for more than twelve years. Deeply imbued with the spirit of his Master, he went about doing good. His pulpit ministrations, catechetical instructions, and pastoral visitations were all highly acceptable to the people of his charge, and were greatly blessed of God, to the conversion and edification of many souls. He was respected and beloved by all who knew him, and it was mainly through his agency that a new life was brought into that part of the Reformed Church, which to this day is diffusing itself, like holy leaven, more and more. The few members of that charge still living, and who enjoyed the privilege of sitting under his ministry, often speak of him with much affection, and delight in relating the wonderful things which God did through him in the midst of them. He received calls elsewhere, and to prominent points, but he declined them all.

When, in 1810, Mr. WAGNER, in consequence of impaired and declining health, resigned the Frederick charge and remov-

ed to York; that congregation, through its consistory, intimated their unanimous wish to Mr. M., that he should become their pastor; but, as he declined accepting, a formal call was not presented. On Mr. WAGNER's death, he was requested to preach a funeral sermon at Frederick, and complied with the request in January, 1811. The sermon was published by the congregation, and is, it is believed, the first publication that emanated from his pen. It was delivered before a very crowded audience, and was spoken of as such an eulogium as TIMOTHY might be supposed to have pronounced on the personal and ministerial character of St. PAUL. The impression it made, revived the desire of the congregation to secure his services, but he would not permit himself to be put in nomination.

It was during his ministry at Shepherdstown, that the First Reformed Church in Baltimore also made an effort to secure his services, but without success. He accepted an invitation, indeed, soon after the death of the Rev. Dr. BECKER, which occurred in 1818, to preach to this congregation, and was the first minister that preached a discourse in English in the Second-street Church. That first English sermon did not fail to make a very deep and powerful impression. The occasion was one of high excitement, and the question to be settled was, whether English preaching should be allowed. The preacher, though threatened with violence if he attempted to preach in the English language, stood firm and unmoved, and delivered a discourse of singular ability and appropriateness. In the course of a few weeks, the congregation unanimously called him to become their pastor; but, for reasons satisfactory to his own mind at least, he respectfully declined the call.

Mr. MAYER continued to labor in the Shepherdstown charge, until some time in the year 1821, when he was induced to accept a call from the Reformed Church, in York, Pennsylvania. Among this people, he labored with like acceptance and success, until he was called by the Synod to preside over the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church. For years, the Church had felt the importance of establishing a school for the more thorough preparation of pious and gifted young men for the work of the ministry, and among the foremost and most active of her ministers in planting the much desired institution, was the subject of this notice. During his residence at Shepherdstown he gave the subject his earnest attention, and for a long time it occupied his mind and elicited his prayers and efforts. Enjoying the respect and confidence of the Synod and of the Church, as a pious, learned, and able

minister, he had it in his power to do much towards the establishment of the institution, and all the influence he possessed was cheerfully exerted in its behalf. By correspondence with the Brethren, as well as by fervent appeals on the floor of Synod, he urged the importance of the establishment of a Theological Seminary, and at length he had the high gratification of seeing his efforts crowned with success. His prayers were answered—his wishes realized. The Synod, at their session in Hagerstown, September, 1820, resolved to establish a Theological School, and the Rev. Dr. MILLEDOLLER, of the Dutch Reformed Church, was unanimously invited to the theological chair. He, however, declined the invitation, although strongly urged by Mr. MAYER and other influential divines in the Church to accept it. The Rev. SAMUEL HELFENSTEIN, (now Doctor,) to whom it was then offered, also declined it; and it must be admitted that the inducements to accept the post were not very strong, as, in all new enterprises of the kind, whilst there was much to hope for, there were many difficulties to be encountered. Mr. MAYER himself was finally induced, through the persuasion of leading ministers and members in the Church, to accept a call tendered him by Synod, although he was distrustful of his qualifications to discharge the high duties of the office to which he had been called, as they differed so widely from those to which he had been accustomed. By close application however to study, he soon qualified himself for the new duties he was called to perform.

Having resigned the charge of the York congregation, Mr. MAYER, in obedience to the call of Synod, moved his family to Carlisle, and in May, 1825, commenced operations in the Seminary. The number of students the first session was only five, but there was a gradual increase from year to year. The friends of the institution rejoiced in the prospect which was now opened to the Church for something like an adequate supply of ministers to cultivate her waste places, and to promote her various interests. The professor was popular, and discharged his duties with great fidelity. But the infant institution was but poorly endowed; and this, in connection with other circumstances, which need not be mentioned here, often proved very embarrassing to the incumbent of the theological chair, and indeed to the Synod itself. At length it was deemed advisable to remove the Seminary from Carlisle; and accordingly, at the meeting of Synod, in Lebanon, September, 1820, it was determined to take it to York, whither it was removed shortly after. During the same year, (1829,) the college of the Reformed Dutch Church,

located at New Brunswick, New Jersey, conferred on Mr. MAYER the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

The Seminary being now located in a more congenial atmosphere, and less embarrassed than at Carlisle, the students increased very fast, and things assumed a much more promising aspect. A second professor in the Seminary, Rev. Mr. Young, was elected, and a classical school was established, under the direction of Dr. RAUCH, which, in the course of a few years, was changed by a State charter into Marshall College. The first president of this institution, was the lamented RAUCH. He was also elected as second professor in the Theological Seminary, after the death of Mr. Young. During all these changes, Dr. MAYER remained steadfast at his post, until the fall of 1835, when the Synod, at its meeting in Chambersburg that year, determined to remove her institutions to Mercersburg, and permanently locate them at that place. Not choosing to follow the Seminary to its place of final destination, chiefly on account of feeble health, he resigned his professorship and remained at York. But in the fall of 1838, at the meeting of the Synod in Lancaster, he was again pressinglly invited to take charge of the important situation made vacant by his own resignation. This invitation he accepted—with the understanding, however, that the appointment should be considered only temporary. And such it was. In October of the following year, at the meeting of the General Synod in Philadelphia, Dr. MAYER again tendered his resignation, which was accepted. From that time to the day of his death, he continued to reside in York, and was engaged, as far as his feeble health would permit, in preparing several important works for the press.

General Estimate of his Character and Abilities.

As a *preacher*, Dr. MAYER was learned, able and faithful. His sermons were well studied. He always considered it due to his congregation as well as to himself, that his preparation for the pulpit should be the best he could make. In the early part of his ministry, it was his custom to write and commit his sermons to memory; but in later years, his discourses were studied and preached, without being first written. His preaching generally was plain and practical, solemn and impressive. In the delivery of his sermons he was measured, earnest, and always very serious. His style was clear, chaste, popular,—often argumentative, and sometimes powerful. Possessing a remarkably

clear and correct mind, he was peculiarly happy in his *explanations* of the Bible, and in setting forth the *true sense* of Scripture. He had a taste for *lecturing*, and his expositions of the sacred text were generally very clear, forcible, and able. The writer remembers, that when he was a student at the Seminary in York, a noted Universalist preacher, Mr. T. F., from the eastward, visited the place, and preached several sermons in the court-house, to large audiences. As some appeared to be carried away with the new and strange doctrine, which Mr. F. set forth in a most eloquent and attractive style, the students of the Seminary requested their professor to deliver a discourse in the Reformed Church, on the subject of universal salvation. He cheerfully complied, and selected as his text the *parable of the tares*, and so ably and convincingly did he discuss the subject, that Mr. F. himself seemed half convinced of the truth. On leaving the Church, he remarked to a friend of the writer, that that was the most clear and forcible exposition of the parable he had ever heard, and pronounced the discourse one of uncommon ability and power. The few who at first appeared somewhat taken with the novelties of Universalism were now re-established in their faith, and Mr. F. did not fail to take the first stage that left for Philadelphia. So high an opinion, also, had the Rev. Dr. CATHCART, of York, of the abilities of Dr. MAYER, as an expounder of the sacred volume,—for many years himself one of the most able lecturers on the Bible in the Presbyterian Church,—that, after preaching, as he did occasionally on Sabbath afternoon, to a country congregation some fifteen miles distant, he would return home to attend Dr. M.'s lecture, in the Reformed Church at night, on the holy Scriptures. This venerable and learned divine once observed to a friend, that he considered Dr. MAYER one of the ablest theologians in this country; and this was the judgment of one who knew him long and intimately, and who was therefore well qualified to form a correct opinion of his learning and abilities. Dr. MAYER was indeed “mighty in the Scriptures,” and it might be expected, therefore, that his preaching would be of no ordinary character. But he was as *faithful* as he was able. He never shunned to “declare the whole counsel of God.” Regarding himself as an ambassador for God, in Christ's stead, and feeling the tremendous responsibility of his high and holy office, “he lifted up his voice, cried aloud, and spared not.” To saint and sinner, he preached as one who felt he must give account, and as one on whose faithfulness depended, in a very great measure, the salvation of those who heard him. The weight of precious

souls was upon him, and he labored prayerfully and diligently, both in season and out of season, that they might be saved.

As a *pastor*, Dr. MAYER is said to have been unsurpassed. There were none more tender, more affectionate,—none who better understood how to direct the penitent; to encourage the believer; to reclaim the wanderer; to impart comfort to the tempted, the bereaved, the afflicted, and to build up the Christian in the faith and knowledge of the Gospel. His own soul had felt so much of the preciousness of Christ and his great salvation, that he well knew how to impart to others the blessed consolations of Christianity. One who had himself, in his early experience, drunk so deeply of the cup of sorrow, and who had, in the hour of anguish and day of trouble, found peace in believing, and comfort in reposing himself on the bosom of Jesus, might well be supposed to be acquainted with the sources of relief, and to understand how to open the broad and deep channels of spiritual consolation to the broken-hearted and distressed. "He was,"—says one who knew him long and well, and who was once a leading elder in one of his congregations, but now a prominent pastor in the Reformed Church,—“He was always greatly admired and much beloved as a pastor. In the discharge of the various duties of the pastoral office, *none could surpass him*. In the sick-chamber, and in the house of mourning, and in the afflicted family circle, there were none more welcome, none more useful.” Feeble health and other causes often prevented him from giving such attention to pastoral visitation as he desired, to give; yet still he performed a large amount of pastoral labor, in visiting the sick, in instructing the young, in comforting and edifying his flock, and in giving attention to the various and important interests of his charge.

As a *professor*, Dr. MAYER was eminently competent. For some thirteen years, he was professor of Theology in the Seminary of the Reformed Church; and during a part of that time, he also gave instruction in the Hebrew language and Church History. And it will be conceded on all sides, that he discharged the duties of that high and responsible office with great ability and fidelity. Dr. MAYER, like many distinguished men of our country, was chiefly indebted to his own untiring industry for his ripe scholarship. He was an excellent linguist, and his acquaintance with various systems of philosophy and theology, both in this country and in Europe—in Germany especially—was very extensive. His mind was peculiarly adapted to the study of biblical antiquities, hermeneutics, exegesis, and didactic, polemic, and pastoral theology. In these studies, ~~he~~ excell-

ed—particularly theology. Few, perhaps, could surpass him in *sermonizing*, and in preparing or dictating *skeletons* of sermons. Possessing a thoroughly disciplined and very accurate mind, and apparently at home in every department of the Holy Scriptures—conversant with the various scopes of the sacred authors, and the meaning to be attached to the words they used—it was comparatively an easy thing for him to dictate a good skeleton from the impulse of the occasion. If a skeleton prepared and read by a student did not please him, he would remodel it at once; and if it were too far out of the way, he would lay it aside altogether, and dictate another for him at the time. It was the custom of the class to write down the skeletons thus dictated, and in this way many of them have been preserved. To his class he always seemed well prepared on the recitation, and perfectly at home on all the subjects claiming attention. He “studied to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” On subjects connected with personal piety he would frequently speak to the students, and embraced every fitting opportunity to give them counsel, and to urge upon them the importance of a prayerful and holy life.

Dr. MAYER was known as a *scholar*, *writer*, and *author*. He was a close and earnest student; a deep and correct thinker; a ripe and finished theological scholar, and a clear and extensive writer. For a long time, he edited, with great acceptance, the *MAGAZINE and MESSENGER* of the German Reformed Church, and occasionally furnished very ably written articles for some of the leading theological reviews at the North. Among his published works are those on the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, and *Lectures on Scriptural Subjects*; and among his unpublished manuscripts there is an extensive treatise on *Theology*, another on *Hermeneutics and Exegesis*, and his *History of the German Reformed Church*,—the first volume of which is now given to the public.

But it is peculiarly pleasant to contemplate Dr. MAYER in the light of a CHRISTIAN. In early life he sought and found the Saviour. He entered into a solemn covenant with the Lord, to obey his will and to be his faithful and willing servant for ever. He unalterably dedicated himself to his service, and throughout life he was a most consistent and exemplary Christian. Free from all ostentation and pride, from all vanity and lightness of manner, he walked humbly and prayerfully before the Lord, and endeavored to perfect holiness in the fear of God. During an intimate acquaintance with him of eighteen years, the writer

never knew him to indulge in any light-mindedness, or in any trifling behaviour whatever. He was indeed remarkable for his correct Christian deportment, and for his holy walk and conversation. Religion with him was not merely a name; it entered deeply into all his thoughts and feelings—subdued and controlled his will—swayed his judgment, and gave tone and character to all his words and actions. His piety was of a serious, modest, retiring character,—yet withal it was earnest and decided. He seemed to live in God and God in him. The doctrines of grace, of free grace, were always delightfully precious doctrines to him, and he loved to speak about them and to dwell upon them. The righteousness of Christ was his righteousness. He felt that Jesus had died for *him*, and could truly say—

“Jesus, *my* Shepherd, Husband, Friend,
My Prophet, Priest, and King,
My Lord, *my* Life, *my* Way, *my* End,
Accept the praise I bring.”

With St. Paul, he gloried in the cross of Christ, and in that only.

In *public life*, Dr. MAYER was prominent, and shared largely in the respect and confidence of all who knew him. He was honored again and again with important appointments and stations, and for many years was a leading member of the Synod of his Church. He had great influence in the Church, and he did not fail to exert it in behalf of her institutions, and in the promotion of her best interests. To the cause of Christ, in general, he was strongly attached; and the friends of religion everywhere found in him a ready and able advocate of all good things. With a mind deeply imbued with the spirit of his divine Lord, and a heart warmed and swayed by his love, he took an active part in promoting genuine revivals of religion, and in building up the interests of Christ's kingdom in the world. In all his *private* relations, also, he exhibited those virtues and graces which adorn the Christian character and life.

As to his personal appearance, Dr. MAYER was of medium size. He did not measure more than five feet eight inches in height, and his frame was slender and erect. His forehead was very high, and indicated great intellectual strength. His eye was keen and penetrating, and his whole appearance commanded reverence and respect. In his dress, he was plain and very neat. His utterance was easy, but not rapid, and his gait rather slow. He was very regular in his habits, and remarkably syste-

matic and precise in what he did. In all things he was a man of order, and observed great regularity and punctuality in all his business transactions. In his intercourse with others, he was gentlemanly and kind. His manners were always pleasant and agreeable, though somewhat reserved in the company of strangers.

Dr. MAYER was twice married; the first time, during his residence at Shepherdstown; the second time, during his residence at Carlisle. By his first marriage he had six children, three of whom are living, and one of them, a son, JOHN L. MAYER, Esq., is an eminent lawyer, in York. By his second marriage he had no children. His first wife was CATHARINE LINE, the daughter of the late JOHN LINE, of Shepherdstown; and his second wife was MARY SMITH, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who survives him.

His Illness and Death.

Dr. MAYER did not enjoy good health for many years. He was always, indeed, more or less feeble in bodily vigor; and yet, as a preacher, pastor, professor, and author, he accomplished a great deal. Like BAXTER and others, affliction did not prevent him from being abundant in labors. But, for the last several years of his life, he was not able to accomplish much, on account of his fast-declining health. During the summer of 1849, the dysentery prevailed in York, in the form of an epidemic, and among others whom it attacked was the subject of this notice. The disease, from the first, was violent, baffling the best medical skill, and leaving little or no hope for his recovery. Kind friends telegraphed the writer of his illness, and he hastened to his bedside, to bid him a last adieu. He found him in fierce conflict with the last enemy, and rapidly sinking into his cold embrace. The power of sight, of hearing, and of utterance had failed him, and his physicians said he could not survive till morning. His pulse beat fainter and fainter; and, ere the sun arose, the great and good man had passed away. That which remained was cold and mortal. He died, surrounded by his family and friends, on the 25th of August, 1849, aged sixty-six years, four months, and twenty-nine days. On Monday afternoon, the 27th of August, his remains were followed to the grave by a large concourse of people, and were interred in the cemetery adjoining the Reformed Church in York, and near the grave of the lamented CARES. An address was delivered,

on the mournful occasion, by the writer, and prayer offered by the Rev. Mr. EMERSON, of the Presbyterian Church. The announcement of the death of one so well and so favorably known awakened feelings of deep sorrow and profound regret throughout the whole Church. All felt that a great, and good, and very useful man in Israel had fallen, and that, too, before some of his most important labors on earth were finished. The Master called him home much sooner than the Church had hoped. But even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.

Baltimore, Md.

E. H.

THE ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice. By WILLIAM ADAMS, S. T. P., Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Wisconsin. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1850. Pp. 379, 8vo.

THIS book is eminently entitled to respect. The author belongs to the far West; having charge of the Episcopal Seminary at Nashotah in Wisconsin, an institution founded in missionary zeal and full of promise, as it would seem, for the future, but in the bosom still of the wilderness and far removed from the usual resources of literature and science. The work however is one that would do honor to the oldest and best endowed seat of learning in the country. It carries with it indeed no particular array of authorities, no imposing apparatus of outward scholarship; but it is still evidently the product of very respectable learning throughout, and of this in its best form, the reading and study of other days incorporated by earnest and profound reflection into the very substance and life of the mind itself. Mr. Adams has carried with him to his present retreat, what is of more account than all libraries, the capital of a full European education, with resolution and power to use it vigorously for spiritual ends in the way of private study. He shows himself in this view a thinker, truly worthy of the name and having some right to be listened to with respect. He is not the mere echo on the one hand of what has been spoken or written by others; his thoughts are the living fruit of his own intellectual and moral life; but neither on the other hand does he pretend to spin them with pure originality out of his separate brain, as though the worth of knowledge depended on its being reduced

as much as possible to the character of insulated subjectivity and particular opinion. There are, we all know, cases of such pedantic affectation, where it is pretended, in the sphere particularly of mental and moral science, to ignore and forget, (if we may speak of forgetting what has never been known,) all that others have brought to pass, and to fall in on the resources of purely private thought and speculation, for the solution of all questions and problems in a perfectly independent and original way; under the imagination that such a course discovers more than ordinary intellectual vigor, and is adapted for this reason to command attention and reverential respect. But no such upstart self-born science can ever be of any truly solid and enduring growth. The book before us is of quite a different character. It bears the impress of original thought on every page, beyond most books that have appeared in this country; but it is the originality of ripe previous culture, which is neither self-born nor upstart, but carries with it the authority that rightfully pertains to genuine learning.

As its title imports, the work is devoted to the interest of Ethics. Its general purpose and drift however are not at once clear, either from the title or preface or first few chapters. This forms indeed a serious bar at the beginning to the interest of the book, even for a thoughtful reader prepared to enter earnestly into the subject of which it treats; and is likely of course to stand still more in the way of its popularity, with those whose reigning temper is not of such earnest cast. It requires something of an effort of patience and attention, to become fairly and properly introduced to the object which the author has in view, so as to move along with him freely in the progress of his discussion. Such patience and attention however are sure to be rewarded in the end, with a full compensation for all their cost. The scope and purpose of the work gradually become clear, interest is enlisted more and more in the subject for its own sake, and the result can hardly fail to be for any earnest reader a wholesome discipline of the heart as well as a true benefit for the understanding.

All individual existence, the author tells us in his preface, is conditioned by two elements, first *nature* and secondly *position*—this last including all the relations, in the midst of which and by means of which it fulfils its destiny. To extend this principle upward to the Life of Man, to apply it to his Moral Being, is the object here in hand. "We take it for granted herein," he says, "that man has a moral nature and constitution, as well as an animal and intellectual being; and that to man as a moral

being there are external facts and institutions that correspond to this moral nature. This treatise seeks to discover, define, and specify distinctly, the various faculties of the moral constitution of man, and so to classify them that they may assume a definite scientific and practical form. And to do this, it considers them in the two-fold point of view, as in themselves first, and secondly their relation to those other external fixed facts which bear upon moral life, as the external circumstances of physical nature do upon the powers of vegetable or animal existence. This, as I have said, is my leading principle, and in reference to this it is, that I define Ethics to be the Science of Man's Nature and Position."—P. 5.

The work is divided into six books. In the first we have a consideration of the nature of Man, under the general inquiry, *Is it good or evil?* The author finds it to be constitutionally good; that is not indifferent to good and evil, like that of brutes, not essentially evil like that of devils, and not dualistically compounded of two different substances one good and the other evil. Some writer, noticing the work in a late number of the *Church Review*, takes exception to this representation, as not being in his apprehension altogether orthodox. It is admitted that Mr. Adams affirms in the most unqualified way the fact of Original Sin; but his view of the essential character of the fallen nature of Man is held to be at variance with the proper force of this fact as taught in the Articles of the Episcopal Church. The true doctrine is, we are told, "that the Will, the Affections, and the Reason, are not now essentially good; that they are vitiated and evil, by an infection which extends to their very nature; that what they need is, not *mere position*, where their own inherent and essential life may develop itself; but, over and beyond all this, the implantation or bestowal of a new and supernatural Element—the imparting of a life which did not before exist, as well as to wash away the stain and guilt of original defilement." Mr. Adams, it is added, "has but re-echoed the sentiments of a certain Dr. Taylor, in his famous 'Concio ad Clerum,' which a few years ago set Congregationalism in New England into a blaze; prompted to the organization of the East Windsor Seminary, &c." Nay, he goes even beyond Dr. Taylor; for whereas this last stopped with simply denying the Evil in Human Nature, Mr. Adams actually affirms the Good. The opponents of Dr. Taylor, according to the reviewer, have not scrupled to charge upon him nothing more nor less than rank Pelagianism; and he has no hesitation in saying, that he too finds it impossible to look upon what Mr. Adams says on this subject in any more favorable light.

But if we have not wholly missed the sense of our author, this criticism is entirely unjust, and proceeds itself on a theological conception which is anything but sound and right. The position maintained here with regard to human nature is not that of Pelagius, and by no means re-echoes simply the doctrine charged on Dr. Taylor. That there is "a fault and corruption of the nature of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam," and that this infection "hath of itself the nature of sin," according to the Anglican Confession, Mr. Adams, we presume, has not for a moment thought of calling in question. The idea of such a real corruption of our nature as makes righteousness forever impossible without the implantation of a new and higher life, runs through his whole book. But what he feels it necessary to guard against, is the imagination that this corruption involves such a depravation of the very substance or essence of man's nature as leaves it in itself incapable of a true moral restoration to righteousness and life. This is the Manichean error, which has by no means gone out of date with the old sect so called, but under new names and phases, like the Pelagian heresy itself of which it is the natural reverse, continues to make itself felt in the Church through all ages. There is a certain style of orthodoxy which is particularly exposed to the danger of falling into this extreme, from the very merit it is disposed to make of its opposition to the wrong which lies on the other side. It measures its zeal for the supernatural character of Divine grace, in the work of salvation, by the extent to which it carries its depreciation of all that belongs naturally to the human subject. Man must be shorn of all goodness, and turned into a demon or a brute, in order to put the more honor, as is supposed, on the power that accomplishes his redemption. But of what account is it to avoid Pelagianism in this way, if in doing so we fall into the arms of Manicheism? Will it magnify the idea of Man's salvation, to conceive of his nature as so lost and depraved that it is in itself no longer capable of being inwardly unfolded to righteousness, but requires for this purpose a re-creation, or new physical construction, imparting to it a wholly different essence? It is one thing surely to say that man cannot save himself, and quite another that he has in himself no capability of being saved even when acted upon by a higher power. The realness of the Christian redemption, as an article of faith, involves both of these conceptions, and falls to the ground with equal necessity by the loss of either. The nature of man is so fallen as to be truly and wholly disabled for righteousness, without the descent into it of a higher

principle from Christ; and still, in the midst of this ruin, it remains salvable, capable of redemption, susceptible of being entered and wrought upon restorationally by this heaven descended grace; which it would not be certainly, if it had become intrinsically brutish or diabolical. To conceive of man's redemption as analogous with a fiat of omnipotence, turning an ox for instance into a pious saint by a miracle of mere power, is to rob the whole mystery in truth of its proper sense. Redemption is not strictly creation, the making of one thing into another absolutely new and different; but the deliverance rather of that which has been restrained and oppressed into its rightful freedom, and the advancement of it thus to its own true perfection. It lies then in the very fact of our human redemption itself, that our human nature, though fallen, is still neither essentially evil nor indifferent to good and evil, but in itself good, and so capable of being recovered by Divine grace to the holiness and glory for which it was originally created.

This we take to be the whole sense of Mr. Adams' doctrine on this subject; which seems to us to be very plainly also the doctrine of the Bible, as well as the view that has the best right to be considered orthodox in the sense of the old Catholic Church, as holding midway between the Pelagian and Manichean extremes, one full as much at war with the true grace of the Gospel as the other. The highest idea for man is Moral Good, and this comes into view fully only in God. The goodness of our nature, that which still shows in us the image of God notwithstanding the fall, and that which makes room thus for our redemption although left to itself it could never originate or produce any such deliverance, appears in the inward determination with which it is carried towards God always as its proper end and rest. Wherein consists then the acknowledged fact of the *fall*? In the withdrawal of that Presence of God which formed for man, in his state of innocence, a natural rule of life and complete law of action; and then in the disorder and insubordination of our natural faculties, following this in the way of consequence. "Here then we are able to answer the question, How is it that man does evil, although in his nature he is good?—Simply it is this, that the very fault and deficiency of his nature is in the *natural inability to do* that which is in accordance with the Will and Law of God; in other words that which is Good. His nature is good, and aspires towards it; the Law that speaks to him is good. Tradition teaches him of Good; all things call forth the desire and the will, but the *ability is wanting by nature*."

The nature of man is complex, made up of various powers and activities. Still as thus manifold its true form requires at the same time an absolute unity. This depends on a certain inward relation and harmony of its several parts. Hence the distinction of governing powers and subordinate powers. Neither of these are in themselves naturally bad ; but where the due relation that should hold between them is lost, we have necessarily a state of evil on both sides. The governing powers, according to our author, are the will, the conscience, the affections, the reason ; the powers that should obey are passions, desires, feelings, appetites, instincts. "Now herein is man's nature of itself, in consequence of the Fall, weakened, that the lower faculties, the passions, desires, feelings, appetites, instincts, these tend to assume the place of the higher, and themselves *to rule* when they ought *to be ruled*. And secondly, the ruling faculties are weakened so as to permit this insubordination."

One of the last charges that can fairly be brought against the book before us, we think, when rightly understood, is that of reducing in any way the force of the old church doctrine of Original Sin. Most solemn stress is laid upon it practically in every part of the discussion. "There is a moral inability to keep God's law perfectly," we are told, "an inability born with us, and which we clearly see not to have belonged to man's nature originally, but to have been the *result of a deterioration*, which is called the Fall. This inability is in the infant ; it develops itself in him just as soon as reason and responsibility begin to develop themselves. And the great end of remission, of forgiveness, of reconciliation, is the putting an end to this inability, *not in itself*, but in actual transgression, and in its own guiltiness. The fact of the inability, and of its origin, every one can see from his own nature.—The nature of Original Sin, the cause of this inability, we do not clearly know in this world, even our deepest imaginings cannot penetrate it. The very consideration of it is involved in the deepest mystery. It would seem that there is a hideousness and horror about it more fearful than we can imagine, when we think that for its remission and pardon the Eternal Word must take flesh, and be born, suffer, die, and be buried, that it should be remitted. It would seem, too, that if we could only comprehend it, sin is ultimately an *actual and real death*, of which the death of this world is only the shadow. It would seem also to be of the nature of an infection, reaching from generation to generation, and from father to son, extending as a disease, loathesome of itself in the eyes of God and Man. It would seem also as if it tainted the nature

of all men as unquestionably the infected nature of diseased animals, although undeveloped, still is in their offspring. It would appear also that there is some impenetrable and mysterious connection, as it were, between the souls of all men—between our souls and the souls of all our progenitors, and consequently with the souls of them in whom the deterioration took place.” —P. 63, 64.

Again : “ The inordinacy that comes from Original Sin, and inability to be obedient to the Law of God, run through *all parts* of man's nature—‘ the whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint ’—and the Body is wounded as the Spiritual part is. But the one is not in its nature wholly or essentially evil any more than the other. ‘ The Body with its powers is in its nature good, but sullen, just as the whole man is ; nay, there is not a function, or a desire, or appetite, or instinct of the Body, that is not in itself good, when it is guided and governed by the Law of God. This is the decision of the Ancient Church against the Manicheans, a decision worthy to be brought up again and again, and impressed and urged upon all men as one of the primal truths of a real Christian Science. ’—Over and above the curse of natural death, the animal mind, or as others call it the understanding, that is the mental power as occupied with the things of sense, is found to be disabled. “ And this, we can see, has taken place in a twofold way : the first by a superinduced imperfection in the action of its faculties ; and the second, by an actual diminution of them in number. ” In this last case the idea is, “ that originally there were in man's nature powers and faculties of body and mind which now he does not possess ; and that these powers having been fully developed, and in full operation, in the Primal Man in his state of Original Righteousness, have, by means of the changed relation of man to all things in consequence of his sin, *shrunk back, as it were, into his being*, and been withered up, until hardly the vestiges and indications of them remain. So that with regard to man, we may say, in reference to those powers and capabilities that they *lie folded up in his being*, never coming to maturity of action or ripeness, as the germ of the fruit in buds that never come to flowers, or as the wings and plumage of the butterfly in the chrysalis, or as the ramifications of trunk and branch, twig and foliage, in the acorn of the oak. ” This seems to be the case in reference to a multitude of powers, “ whose existence and nature we can hardly guess at, save in the one way of analogical conjecture that they must have been of those that bound the external world in obedience to his commands. The being, nature, and extent of

these powers, what they are, or how, in what condition they would place man if *now* called forth, seems to be wrapped up in utter darkness; but that such have an actual existence as *possibilities*, it seems to me all things around us, by their analogies, lead us immediately to conclude."—*P.* 241-246.

The most jealous orthodoxy, we should think, can have no good reason to complain of the teaching of Mr. Adams, on the score of the article here in question, though he *does* take pains to show that man, in his fallen state, has not become either a fiend or a brute.

The second book is devoted to the consideration of *Conscience*, the first of the four governing powers in man's nature; the third to the *Spiritual Reason*; the fourth to the *Heart* or *Affections*; the fifth to the *Family* or *Home and its Affections*; the sixth to the *Human Will*. Under each of these heads we have several chapters of excellent thought, and a fund of rich practical observation well fitted to make the reader both wiser and better. The whole subject is handled at the same time in the way of life, rather than as a matter of speculation. It is made to carry with it the form of an earnest direct appeal continually to the experience of those who read. The general character and spirit of the work in this view may be learned from the following extract:

"There is one especial difficulty about Ethics, in that it is a science of which each one has the requisite knowledge in his own consciousness; and the presentation of it, then, in an external systematic form, is almost impossible. The business therefore of the writer, so far as he can, is to present the truths in such a manner, that each one may recognize them as facts of his own nature, and accede to the rules drawn forth by the author; but for putting it in a mechanically systematic order, it is a thing which the very nature of the science forbids. The true system in it is not of external arrangement, but of internal sequency, so that fact shall lead to fact, and principle be made a foundation-stone to principle: that so the reader shall be led to think upon his own nature, and to see by it that the principles of the science are true. For often it happens that a fact or truth shall be denied by him under the influence of prejudice or of ignorance, which had he seen it in its ethical connection with others of which he would make no doubt, though they have never been brought up consciously to his mind, he would at once have acknowledged to be true. Let not the reader then expect this external, mechanically systematic order from us; we are content if we present the various truths of Ethical Science in the peculiar systematic method which we have described above—

that form which we feel most appropriate to a science, all the facts of which are in existence in each one's breast."—P. 187.

The aim and scope of Mr. Adams' work are in the fullest sense churchly and christian. It does not propose however to be a direct exhibition of the idea of religion, as this springs from the grace of the Gospel. The author himself is careful to tell us, that Practical Christianity, as it is reached by human nature in covenant with God, forms a higher sphere of truth to which the discussion here presented must be taken as simply preliminary and introductory.

"The Ethics of a human being endued with this high privilege, placed in this lofty position, while manifestly it is *not opposite* to that of the man who is of nature only, not of grace—has only the capabilities instead of the gifts, but is the crowning and completion of it—is still something infinitely higher and infinitely more perfect. As the stately palm in the desert, crowned with its diadem of leaves at once, and flowers and fruit, is to the date borne in the hand of the wandering Arab, so is the true science of the Christian Life to the loftiest and truest philosophy of Nature apart from Grace. In both cases, it is true, the germ exists the same, but in the latter the influences are wanting that shall develop it. That germ in the case of the natural man, the spiritual nature that is in him existing, which renders him capable of grace, I have in this book treated of. Spiritual Ethics, the ethics of man in covenant with God, is a distinct and higher part of the same science, and is practical Christianity. At some future time, in the ripeness of maturer years and by the light of fuller knowledge, I may enter upon the examination of this loftier science."—P. 375, 376.

Here again the Reviewer before noticed affects to find a theological latitudinarianism. He will have it, that morality is a word of no meaning short of full Christianity. "Here in our judgment," he tells us, "is the grand mistake of the writer, which runs through his entire book. He has looked first upon human nature, its condition, character, susceptibilities and capabilities, in a *humanitarian* rather than a Christian aspect, and has based its moral training upon its natural capabilities, rather than upon its supernatural relation and assistances." Again: "Mr. Adams would have been truer to his title, had he at once thrown aside every thing like a mere human philosophy, and contemplated human nature, not in its original or fallen state merely, but also as redeemed, and brought henceforth into new relations, and under new and supernatural influences. In doing

this, he would we think have been guarded from positions, which seem to us erroneous and exceedingly unfortunate."—But this is to wrong egregiously both Mr. Adams and the subject of his book. It is not true, that he pretends to construct a science of man's moral nature on simply humanitarian ground, or that he has no regard to redemption as the necessary condition of morality and virtue in any complete form. On the contrary, his work is designed and well suited to shut men up to Christ, and to lead to him pedagogically, from beginning to end. It goes however on the assumption that Christ came, not to destroy, but to fulfil the sense which belongs to man's nature naturally considered; and that to understand this properly, is the surest way of seeing and feeling the necessity of that higher economy of supernatural grace and power, which is brought to light through him by the Church. Morality is not at once Religion, and still less Christianity; although it is perfectly true, that it can never complete itself except under this high form. Christianity does not bring into man his ethical nature, his moral necessities and capabilities, as though he were before a tree or a beast; it finds him with all this, and proves itself to be from God by meeting it with the power of a higher life, the complement of supernatural grace, whereby alone it can be redeemed from the law of sin and raised into true freedom. There is fair reason then, and full room, for such a study of Man ethically taken, as Mr. Adams here attempts, in the way of propædæutic discipline to the full science of Practical Christianity; and the censure which we have just quoted strikes us, accordingly, as altogether more nice than sound.

We close with a brief extract from the *Concluding Remarks* of the author, which may serve still farther to illustrate his somewhat quaint style, as well as the general aim and spirit of his work:

"I must now, in all justice to my reader, tell him that the system I have here laid before him is not a system of my own, invented by myself, but that it is the Ethical Science of the first Christians, as far as I have been able to distinguish and feel it. This I have, as it were, translated into the thought of our age and time, out of the thought of men of different ages and different times. That is, I have attempted to present, in a scientific form, as a *system*, before the ordinary reader, the Ethics of Christianity, as held by the Church unbroken, before the ambition of Rome and the pragmatical spirit of Constantinople had rent the Church in two. —If the reader who has gone thus far is contented with it, thinks

that it gives a sufficient and satisfactory account of Human Nature, its problems and their solution, in the first place I claim from him no praise, personally in this book. I profess to present the Ethics of the Ancient Church. Augustine, Athanasius, Cyril, Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, these men whom every puny writer of the present day thinks himself privileged to scorn at—these are the sources from which I have obtained the principles here presented in a connected form; men who, often by the meditation of a whole life of holiness and self-denial, thought out and established forever the Christian solution of a single one of the problems of nature herein discussed. These results the theologian will often discern, in these pages, given in a few lines, while, in the original, volumes hardly embrace their discussion. For myself therefore I claim no praise of originality or genius; but that one of bringing again before the world, in a shape to every one tangible, the Ethical Science of Apostolic Christianity, undivided and at unity with itself.—So far with regard to myself I have said to him, who has thus far read the treatise with satisfaction; now, *with regard to himself*, I say, if he be convinced of the truth of these principles, let him not for a moment abide in a barren philosophy, but *act upon the principles* herein laid down. Let him begin to cultivate his Spiritual Inward Nature at all risks, and under all pain and loss to make it the ruling and supreme governor of his action.—The author has now come to the end of a laborious work, which he felt to be needed. He has worked upon it sincerely and ardently, for he knew of no book embracing the subjects treated upon herein, so as to be accessible to the mass of readers and at the same time pleasing to them. How he has succeeded time will tell; but if the reader feels that the author has so far succeeded as to supply, even in a small degree, the great want of a book upon these subjects, the author would ask of him *not to let the book rest upon his shelves*, but to bring it before the notice of those to whom it is likely to be of service."

J. W. N.

SCHAFF'S CHURCH HISTORY.

Geschichte der christlichen Kirche von ihrer Gründung bis auf die Gegenwart. Dargestellt von PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor der Theologie in Predigerseminar zu Mercersburg in Pennsylvanien. Matth. xiii: 31-33. Erster Band: Die allgemeine Einleitung und die erste Periode, von Pfingst-feste bis zum Tode des heil. Johannes. (a. 30-100.) Mercersburg, Pa.: Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Zu haben bei: *Ernst Schäfer* in Philadelphia und Leipzig; *Rudolph Garrigue* in New-York. 1851.

THE appearance of this work deserves to be considered certainly something of an event. It is the first volume of what proposes to be a full History of the Christian Church from its origin down to the present time, replete with German learning and written in the best and purest German style, worthy in this respect to compare with the first productions of like character in Germany itself and sure to be received with respect among leading scholars in that land of literature and science; and yet it is in full an American work, brought out in a retired American village, where it was necessary even to create the press that was required for its publication, and designed primarily for the use of a public on this side of the Atlantic. For those who are at all acquainted with the difficulties that were to be surmounted in the case, the execution of such a work, and the highly respectable style in which it appears, cannot fail to be taken as highly complimentary to the resolution, patience and persevering diligence of the author, no less than to his learning and scholarship. The outward show of the book is in all respects neat and handsome, and well suited to the dignity of its subject and theme. Its real substantial worth however lies of course in its contents; and we have no doubt that the estimate put upon it in this view by all competent judges, will be favorable in the highest degree.

The work bears upon it the marks of true learning and vigorous independent thought from the first page to the last. In the nature of the case a Church History may not pretend to absolute originality; it must go over the same field of matter and fact that has been already passed over by many previous works of the same sort; and to make no account of what has been thus done by others, would be to forfeit from the start all claim to rational respect. The author before us affects no such false and weak singularity; but owns in full what may be called the *historical* character of the science of Church History itself, aiming

to understand its objective movement from the beginning down to the present time, and so to throw himself with free clear consciousness into the stream which thus unites in itself the wealth and strength of this art as it has been cultivated by other hands, the results of experience and study handed forward from other times. Very special account is made in this way of the labors of *Neander*, in whom the previous course of the science may be said to have reached a new grand epoch, and to have found a depth and comprehensiveness of meaning of which the world had no knowledge before. Dr. Schaff takes pains to acknowledge his obligations to the learning of this great man, and still more to his genius and spirit. It was desired from the first to bring out the work in some connection with his name, and as it were under the auspices of his paternal friendship; and he was solicited accordingly at the outset for permission to address it to him in the way of dedication. This permission was granted in the most friendly terms; but in the mean time, alas, the venerable *Neander*, to the grief of the whole Christian world, has been snatched away by death; and the work before us is now dedicated only to his MEMORY: "*Dem Andenken des seligen Dr. August Neander, Vaters der neueren Kirchengeschichte.*" In this title, father or patriarch of Modern Church History, he may be regarded as by universal consent now fairly and firmly established. No writer after him can deserve regard, who shows himself ignorant of his labors or insensible to their high and enduring value. To admit this however in his favor and to own as he also was ready to do the value of other and older services in the sphere of the same science, is not to preclude by any means the idea that there is room and need still for farther progress in its cultivation. The proper merit of such a genius as *Neander*, is not that he has exhausted and brought to an end the art of which he appears the father, taking away thus all opportunity for others to do more than repeat his work, but this rather, that he throws open to the human spirit a new stadium of activity, and imparts to it at the same time the stimulus of a fresh enthusiasm, by which it is encouraged and impelled to proceed still farther with new and independent movement in the direction of such salutary impulse. This is the relation in which the work before us stands to the historical authority of its own science, in the view now noticed. It is the birth and product truly of that *Modern Church History*, of which *Neander* is acknowledged to be the presiding genius and great ruling star. But with all this, it is no loose compilation merely or servile copy, either in whole or in part, of what has been written by others. It is truly an

independent and original work, the fruit of active personal study, a genuine creation of art, having its own form and spirit from beginning to end. Whatever it may owe to others, all has been evidently reproduced in the way of living thought, and appears under a character of fresh and glowing interest springing in this way directly from the life of the subject itself. The author has his own theory and scheme, his own method, his own order and proportion, and his own style. In all this too, so far as he has yet gone, we consider him eminently successful. His work is at once thoroughly learned and strikingly plain and popular. This last advantage it owes, both to its clear distribution of topics and its nervously compact and direct style, intermediate we may say between the aphoristic sententiousness of *Hase* and the heavy lumbering periods of *Guericke*. It is of a decidedly better form in this respect, particularly for American use, than the great work even of Neander; for it lay in the whole character of this great and good man, in his supreme regard to the inward, the spiritual soul and substance of things, to overlook and neglect even to downright slovenliness itself the claims of the outward and formal in almost every respect. He paid no earnest attention whatever either to method or style, but like the old African father Tertullian seems to have shrunk rather from every such rhetorical care, as a sort of outside nicety in which a christian should take no concern. The consequence is, that the charm of his works lies wholly in the power by which he has been able to throw into them the very life of his own soul, and is exerted continually in spite of his style—which is for the most part loose and clumsy in the extreme. The work before us labors under no such objection. On the contrary it is a model of historical order and clearness.

We have here the first volume only of a work, which is expected, when complete, to embrace the entire history of the Christian Church from its foundation down to the present time. To write such a history is a great undertaking, not to be completed under years of persevering study and labor, and subject to many difficulties and uncertainties, of which our author seems to have full sense, and in view of which he is properly cautious as regards binding himself with absolute promises for the future. We trust that his life may be spared for the work, and that he may have ample encouragement and fair opportunity to fulfil in due time the whole measure of his present plan. His taste and talent seem happily joined to qualify him for such a service, and to urge him towards it as his proper mission; while there can be no question of its high importance, as deserving to the fullest

extent all the diligence and zeal that may be required for its accomplishment. At the same time however, there is no reason for considering the full and final completion of so large a plan necessary in any way to the completeness and value of the several portions of history of which the whole is to be composed, provided only these portions are made to embrace in a full and sufficient manner periods that are actually in their own nature thus separate and distinct. In this view, the volume here in consideration forms in truth, not the fragment simply of a full Church History, but a work which may be regarded as finished and complete for the period to which it is devoted, (as much as this can be said to be the case with *any* history,) even if the author should be prevented hereafter from executing in full his present plan. It is occupied simply with the Apostolical Period, the founding of the Church and its first fortunes as they come before us in the writings of the New Testament. No period can be more important or full of interest; for as it forms historically the introduction to the whole subsequent development of the Christian life, it is plain that the knowledge we have of it, and the view we take of it, must condition materially always our judgment of the history of the Church in all following ages. For this reason also the treatment of this period, above that of any other, should be made to carry a separate form, and to appear as in the case before us in the character of an independent and distinct work, introductory to the General History of later times, but without subjection to any of the ecclesiastical schemes that come in necessarily to influence the view taken of this later history in all its parts.

To form some conception of the importance and interesting character of this first volume of Dr. Schaff's History, it is sufficient simply to glance at its general plan and division, and to consider the several subjects and topics that are made to pass in lively succession before the eye of the reader. It commences with a masterly and well digested Introduction, reaching through seventy eight pages, and embracing the following scheme of chapters and sections: I. *History*—1. Its conception; 2. Its factors; 3. The central position of religion in history. II. *The Church*—1. Idea of the Church; 2. Its development; 3. The Church and the World. III. *Church History*—1. Definition; 2. Compass; 3. Relation to other branches of theology; 4. History of the growth and persecution of the Church; 5. History of doctrine; 6. History of practical religion, government and discipline; 7. History of worship; 8. Sources; 9. Compensation for the study of sources; 10. Method of historiogra-

phy; 11. Division of Church History; 12. General characteristics of the three grand eras of Church History; 13. The uses and advantages of the science. IV. *The Progress of Church History as a Science*—1. Church Historians before the Reformation; 2. Roman Catholic Historians; 3. Protestant Historians to the time of Semler; 4. Protestant Historians since Semler.—The entire history of the Church, from the beginning down to the present time, is divided into three grand eras, each falling again into as many separate subordinate periods. The first era is that of the PRIMITIVE or GRÆCO-LATIN UNIVERSAL CHURCH, extending from the Day of Pentecost to the time of Gregory the Great, (a. 30–590); embracing as its three periods the *Apostolical Church*, to the death of the Apostles, the *Church under Persecution*, to the time of Constantine (a. 311), and the *Church of the Græco-Roman Empire*, amid the storms of invasion and revolution which brought on finally its fall. The second era is that of the CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES or of ROMANO-GERMANIC CATHOLICISM, reaching from the time of Gregory down to the Reformation (a. 590–1517); with its three periods of the *Commencement of the Middle Ages*, the planting of the Gospel among the Germanic nations on to the rise of Hildebrand (a. 1049), the *Bloom of the Middle Ages*, the palmy period of the Papacy, Monasticism, Scholasticism and Mysticism, on to the time of Boniface VIII. (a. 1303), and the *Decline of the Middle Ages* opening the way to the Reformation. The third era finally is that of the MODERN or EVANGELICAL PROTESTANT CHURCH in conflict with the ROMAN CATHOLIC, from the Reformation to the present time; having for its subordinate periods, the *Reformation* or *Productive Protestantism*, as it appears in the sixteenth century, *Orthodox Scholastic Protestantism*, characteristic of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth, and *Unchurchly Negative Protestantism*, (Rationalism and Sectarianism,) preparing the way transitionally for a *new era*.—The volume now offered to the public, it will be perceived, is occupied altogether with the first period simply of the first era in this scheme. It confines itself, as before said, to the consideration of the Apostolical Church.

Here we have again an Introduction, looking directly to the history in hand. This brings into view the general relation of Christianity to the previous state of the world, the historical preparation for it which went before in the form of Paganism as well as in that of Judaism—the Grecian culture, its decline, Platonism, the Roman empire, its interior state, Stoicism—the Old Testament Revelation, the political condition of the Jews when

Christ came, their religious state—the influence of Judaism on Paganism, and of this last again on the first—all conspiring to show the need of Christ and to make room for his coming.

Book First, in the next place, treats of the founding of the Church, its spread and persecution, under a division of five chapters. Chap. I. sets before us its proper *Birth-Day*, the miracle of Pentecost, the gift of tongues, the preaching of Peter and its memorable results. Chap. II. has for its title, *The Mission in Palestine* and the Way Opened for the Conversion of the Gentiles—with the topics: The fortunes of the Church at Jerusalem; Stephen, the first martyr; Christianity in Samaria and the ministry of Philip; The conversion of Cornelius; Commencement of the mission among the Gentiles; The congregation at Antioch, and rise of the Christian name. Chap. III. is devoted to the life and labors of the *Apostle Paul* and the planting of the Gospel among the Gentiles, in a series of sections, extending through more than a hundred pages, that serve to bring into view all the leading occasions of his history and the various important relations of his ministry to the progress of the Christian cause. His early character and education, his conversion, his call to the apostleship, his missionary activity, his various journeys, his epistles, his controversies with heretics, his manifold persecutions and trials, all receive proper consideration. Here also various chronological questions and other doubtful points of history are examined with no small amount of learned diligence and labor. Chap. IV. treats of the *Labors* of the other *Apostles* on to the Destruction of Jerusalem: The character of *Peter*; his position in the History of the Church; his later labors; his epistles; his residence at Rome and martyrdom; *James*, the Just; the Epistle of James; Traditions concerning the Apostles; The overthrow of Jerusalem. Chap. V. gives us the *Life and Work of St. John*; his birth and education; his apostolical activity; his banishment under Domitian to Patmos; his return to Ephesus and the close of his life there; his character as compared with Peter and Paul; his writings—Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse.

Book Second has for its general subject the Practical Religious Life of the first Christians. Chap. I. *The Influence of Christianity on the Moral Relations*. Topics: The new creation; The Apostles; Family life; Marriage and celibacy; Christianity and Slavery; Christian Brotherhood; Social and National Life. Chap. II. *Spiritual Gifts*. Chap. III. *Church Discipline*.

Book Third is an interesting view of the Government and

Worship of the Apostolical Church. Chap. I. *The Ministerial Office in General*. Topics: Its origin and design; Its derivation from the apostolate—distinction into church and congregation offices; Election and ordination of officers; Support of ministers; Relation of officers to the congregations. Chap. II. *Church Officers*: The apostolate; Prophets; Evangelists.—Chap. III. *Congregational Officers*: Presbyter-bishops; their office; Deacons; Deaconesses; Angels of the Apocalypse.—Chap. IV. *Divine Service*. Topics: Signification of Christian worship and its relation to the Jewish; Sacred places and seasons; Sunday; Year Festivals; Separate parts of Worship; Baptism; Infant baptism; The Lord's Supper; Other Sacred Rites.

Book Fourth treats of Doctrine and Theology. Chap. I. *The Apostolical Literature and Theology in general*: Origin of the New Testament—The Historical Books—John and the other Evangelists—The Acts of the Apostles—Didactic Writings—The Apocalypse—Organism of the Apostolical Literature—Language and Style of the New Testament. Chap. II. *The Apostolical Types of Doctrine*: Origin and Unity of the Apostles' Doctrine—Difference—Jewish and Gentile Christianity—Jewish Legal type of James—James and Paul—Jewish Prophetic type of Peter—Matthew, Mark and Jude—Gentile type of Paul—Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews—Ideal type of John. Chap. III. *Heretical Tendencies*: Conception of Heresy—Division and general character of Heresies—Typical Signification of the Apostolical Church.

We quote in conclusion a portion of the author's Preface, exhibiting his own idea of the work he has undertaken and its general purpose or plan:

"To portray with conscientious fidelity to original documents, in clear life-like representation, the History of the Church of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God and Redeemer of the world, to reproduce her inward and outward fortunes, her conflicts and victories, her sorrows and joys, her thoughts, words and deeds, with ardent love for the truth and broad catholic feeling, and to hold up this picture of eighteen centuries to the view of the present time as the most perfect Defence of Christianity, for instruction and warning, for edification and example:—this is a task, well worthy to engage the best powers of a long life, and carrying with it the largest reward, but at the same time so vast and wide, that its execution, if it is to be in any measure satisfactory, can be reached only by the co-operation of the most various agencies. The single workman, especially one of sub-

ordinate capacity, must count it honor and happiness enough, if he be permitted to contribute some stones merely to the gigantic structure, which in its very nature cannot be completed till the Church shall have reached the goal of her history. For science grows with experience, and becomes ultimately complete only by its means."

—"My plan aims, under the guidance of our Lord's twin parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, and from the best sources within my reach, to sketch as far as possible a true and graphic picture of the internal and external progress of the Christian Church from its foundation down to our time, for the benefit both theoretically and practically of ministers and theological students, and to aid in this way a proper understanding of the present and a wise hopeful activity for the interests of the future. As regards compass, I propose to steer mid-way, between the synoptical brevity of a mere compend, and the voluminous fullness of a work which seeks to exhaust its subject and is designed simply for the professional scholar. The number of volumes will correspond probably with the periods presented in the General Division. I know too well already however the uncertainty of any such calculation, to lay myself here under any fixed bond in advance, or even to promise absolutely the continuation of the work. The volume now published has turned out much larger than I at first designed. The Apostolical Period however, in view of its fundamental and normative significance, is fairly entitled to a more extensive treatment than the Periods that follow; and it seemed to me necessary moreover to take account directly and indirectly of the late efforts of *Baur* and his school, having for their object, with no small outlay of learning, sagacity and art, a reconstruction of Primitive Christianity, or more properly its destruction—which has had the effect of swelling considerably the number of notes.

"While now my book shows signs on every page of its *German* origin, it is still primarily and immediately designed for *American* readers, and written, so to speak, from an American, or more strictly, Anglo-Germanic position. I have accordingly had regard more or less to the more important productions of English literature, touching on the same field; and propose in later parts of the work, in case it is continued, to treat of English, Scotch and American Church History at much greater length, than is done usually in German works of the same size. Germany has no lack of books on Ecclesiastical History; even since this volume has been under the press, three valuable new compends have appeared there from *Lindner*, *Fricke* and *Jaco-*

bi—with which however my work, from its difference of plan and size, comes into no conflict. Widely different is the case in America, where it has been the fashion heretofore in almost all Theological Seminaries, as in England also, to rest satisfied with a translation of *Mosheim*. Quite recently however translations also of the works of *Neander* and *Gieseler*, still unfortunately incomplete, are coming to be widely studied, and the time is not far distant, when this energetic restlessly active nation of the future shall do its part likewise in the independent culture and promotion of the science of general church history. Of this we have a guaranty already, in the able contributions that have been made to particular sections of this discipline, as well as in the distinguished success with which several highly gifted Americans have been crowned in the department of profane history. Would that I could do something, in my humble measure, to encourage an impartial study of historical theology in my adopted country, and excite to works that may leave my own far behind! Education and outward position seem to impose it on me as a duty, in this time of critical transition and on this ominous muster field of all the good and bad powers of waning Europe and youthfully fresh America, to labor in the service of German theology for American use, and as far as in me lies to mediate thus between the most theoretical and the most practical of existing nations, between the Greeks and the Romans of the modern world.”

We trust the work will find proper patronage and favor. If its circulation be in any sort of proportion to its merits, it cannot fail to be both lasting and wide.

J. W. N.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. IV.

OUR NATIONAL RELIGION.

How many quires have been filled with glowing descriptions of the already acquired greatness, and prospective glory of the Young Republic of North America! How many writers have vied with each other, in attempting to delineate in appropriate colors, the extent, fertility and natural beauties of her vast territory, and to exhibit in adequate numbers the sum of her agricultural wealth, and rich, ever expanding mineral and commercial resources! How many volumes might be gathered, if all that loving enthusiastic hearts, and admiring minds, have spoken and written, in the patriotic oration, the thoughtful essay, or the racy narrative, could be found and rescued from the must and moth! And yet the tithe of the reality has not been told. Although the subject has been the theme of many of the liveliest imaginations, and ablest pens, and much that was even wild and hyperbolic has been spoken and written upon it, no adequate conception of what our country really is, much less of what she promises to be, has yet been formed. The tithe of it has not been thought. Indeed the tenth of it has not yet had time to develop itself. Many even of our keenest-eyed Statesmen, though occupying a position commanding by its height a far-reaching view, have but recently begun to comprehend the ter-

VOL. III.—NO. IV.

territorial interests involved in the millions upon millions of acres of unoccupied, unexplored land, included in our national possessions. Even when facts are numerically or statistically known, it requires time before proper conceptions of them are formed in the mind. But if this is true in reference merely to the pecuniary interests involved in the territorial extent of the country, how much more imperfect must be the prevailing conception of other and higher interests claiming consideration in a case like this! Who shall say or who shall conceive, what will be the actual wealth, the political power, the national influence of Our Country, when all the latent resources and treasures of its timbered hills, and verdant valleys, its mountains of iron, coal, and copper, its lakes of salt, and rivers of gold, shall be fairly brought out, and be fully developed! And still more who shall conceive the actual state and position of our country, as well within itself, as in its relations to the rest of the world, when the *latent intellectual and moral resources*, of minds and hearts, moulded amid scenes and by circumstances like those existing and abounding here, shall approximate toward their proper development!

No wonder that earnest and thoughtful men, have gazed upon the solemn prospect, which the contemplation of such a future opens, with trembling bewilderment. The narrowest secular considerations involved in the case, may well create profound concern. It requires no keen prophetic vision to foresee, that a Government holding control over such vast interests, must speedily acquire an amount of political and moral influence, far surpassing what has ever been possessed by any other secular power; that the day is rapidly approaching, when, humanly speaking, the political and social system of our country, will be the mind and heart of the world, and when the pulse that beats here, will thrill through all the arteries of the Race.

And who that has the faintest conceptions of this, can be indifferent to the *character* of the unlimited influence, which will then be possessed and exerted? Who that has the prosperity of his country, the welfare of society, and the glory of God at heart, can regard with unconcern the elements which are now daily mingling, more and more freely, in the production of this influence? Above all, who that knows how indispensable correct religious principles are to its purity, and how hopelessly and potentially pernicious it must be without them, can be else than anxious to know whether such principles have been mingling in due proportion with other formative elements, and to what extent they are likely to do so in the future? Are these principles the salt of every social system, and shall we not care to know

whether they be found in sufficient measure in our's, to secure it against speedy corruption and dissolution? Are they the light of the body social, and shall it not matter to us, whether the system with which we and our children are so closely bound up, is moving onward, like a huge growing Polyphemus, blindly and madly to a destruction the more terrible because so vast?

Right heartily do we believe, and as frankly confess the conviction, that in these latter times no Government can long maintain its integrity, or prosper even in so far as to afford quiet and peaceful homes to its citizens, unless it be based upon the conservative principles of Christianity, and in its general movements yield respect and conformity thereto. Rome might rise and flourish for a thousand years, though based upon a Pagan foundation, and propped by the pillars of heathen politics and philosophy. "The times of that ignorance God winked at." But it is a vain, not to say profane, hope, if any proudly and atheistically indulge it, that such prosperity may be repeated in a similar form, by the American Republic.

It is with these convictions that we are led to inquire into *the relation existing between our Civil Government and Religion*. Does our National Constitution, do our State Constitutions take any cognizance at all of Religion? Do they seem to be aware of the existence of religious principles, and religious systems, in the world around, and in their own midst; and do they seem willing at all, to show favor to any particular system of Religion, or set of religious principles, in manifest preference to others? Or is every reference of this sort scrupulously avoided, and conscientiously excluded? As far as the general Constitutions, and special laws of the land are concerned, are they throughout, rigidly neutral and impartial—quite as favorable to Turks and Hottentots, as to the most devout and zealous christians?

These questions will indicate the subject and aim of the present essay. And the consideration of them must awaken the deeper interest, at least in christian minds, in view of the fact that from the days of Jefferson onward, not a few have answered the first two with a most earnest and unequivocal negative, and the last two with an equally decided affirmative.

Whatever may have been his real views and motives, Jefferson already avowed it as his conviction that "our laws apply the only antidote to the vice (of sectarian intolerance), by placing all religions (Jewish, Pagan, Mohammedan) on an equal footing." That so obsequious and ambitious a politician as Jefferson, and one whose sympathies with the masses were so sickly and selfish, should indulge rather freely in rhetoric like this,

when writing to an Israelite, explains itself. But there is little doubt that his religious liberalism would predispose him to cherish such a sentiment, as his hearty conviction. And no one will deny that its source has given it weight. Of this we find proof indeed in the fact that he is so frequently appealed to as authority, and that his opinion is considered by many as decisive.

This is the opinion upon which the famous *Sunday Mails* Report of 1829 is based. The prayer of the petitioners was denied mainly upon the ground, that the Congress of the United States have nothing to do with questions involving Religion, and therefore could not interfere on the behalf of those who made the application in the case. Some of the sentiments set forth in that notable document, in vindication and illustration of this view, are so remarkable that we may be allowed to quote them.

After stating in an introductory paragraph that the principle upon which the National Legislature suspends all public business upon one day in seven, is strictly one of political expediency, based upon purely natural laws, and sanctioned by the usage of all nations, (not even excepting the Chinese?), the Report proceeds: "It should, however, be kept in mind, that the proper object of Government, is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious, as well as civil rights; and not to determine, for any, whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike." (By this was evidently meant, not simply that Government should not suffer itself to become committed to any particular opinion relatively to a day of religious worship, but rather that it had no right to give special countenance to any form of religious opinion, or any set of religious views, whatever. The Report then proceeds): "We are aware that a variety of sentiment exists among the good citizens of this nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our Government is designed for the protection of one, as much as for another. *

* * * With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that Congress cannot interfere. It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true or false. Our government is a civil, and not a religious institution. Our constitution recognizes in every person, the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens, and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the Government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others. * * * Should congress in their legislative capacity, adopt the sentiment, (that the first day of the week should be

kept sacred) it would establish the principle, that the legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision in a religious controversy, * * *. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds. Among all the religious persecutions, with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered, but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the equal rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions," * * * * *

"If the principle is once established, that religion or religious observances shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for the worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority. What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them. *Let the national legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds.* The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the Divine prerogative in this country, which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the old world."—With the merits of the question at issue in this report, the present essay has nothing to do. But it is evident that the author of the Report himself cared very little about the special subject then claiming his attention. Whether the Sabbath should be sanctified or secularized by legislative enactment, was clearly the least concern of the majority of the committee. The great matter was, to seize the opportunity thus afforded, for promulgating a doctrine which, by unavoidable necessity, leads the Government to lay the axe at the root of all religion, under the hypocritical pretence of patronizing none.

It is easy to conceive why Mr. Johnson should desire to have a report in which a great deal of error was so adroitly entangled with a few self-evident truths, passed and printed without being read. But that deceptive declarations like these should be favorably received by a majority of the National Representatives, before whom they were made, may well amaze us. Even upon the admission, that many sustained the ultimate position taken in the Report, of non-interference on the part of the Government in matters affecting the religious convictions of its citizens, without intending to endorse all the sentiments incidentally introduced, it is still inexplicable that a document, pretending to be a calm and an impartial defence of the religious rights of all our citizens against political infractions, and yet abounding in such badly concealed, bitter, bigotry, should find sufficient favor to carry it successfully through. A cursory examination, however, into the constituency of our National Legislature at the time, might suggest more than one hint explanatory of the strange result arrived at. When motives of a private and selfish nature combine with personal indifference to Religious principles, politicians may find it convenient and easy to compromise many a moral conviction, and give their voice to many a measure of doubtful justice. How much more readily will not those disregard the claims of Religion, and vote away its rights, who are at heart hostile to some of its most sacred principles. The opposition with which the views proclaimed in this Report were met, by the few who ventured to espouse the cause of truth, shows how deeply the injustice and wrong inflicted upon them and their constituents, by the document, was felt. And to this day the convictions, even of many who rejoiced in its final adoption, are, that its success was owing rather to fortuitous circumstances, than to the real force of its arguments, or the agreement of its conclusions, with the spirit of our Federal Constitution or the genius of our National Government. Though the question was legislatively settled at the time, it still continues to be the firm conviction of thousands, that the issue then reached, is in violent conflict with the fundamental principles of our Laws, and therefore cannot be final. The numerous friends of the measure thus defeated, though unprepared for their disappointment, and still more alarmed at the reasons assigned for denying a request supported by arguments so profound and cogent as those assigned in their petition, and proceeding from so large and respectable a number of citizens, continue firm in the convictions then expressed, and are slow to believe that our Gov-

ernment is really as atheistic, as she was at the time persuaded to avow herself.

It must be granted however that this doctrine of the Jeffersonian school, upon the relation of the National and State Governments to Religion, has widely influenced the popular mind upon the subject. The prevailing conviction must be allowed to be, that the highest evidence of the consummate wisdom and political worth, of our Federal and Special constitutions, is furnished by their cold neutrality, and complete indifference upon the general subject of Religion. Not simply is it affirmed and believed, that political *protection* is extended equally to all classes of religious persuasions, so that every man may sit under his own vine and fig-tree, none daring to molest him or make him afraid. The popular notion of the toleration principle, includes *something more neutral and callous* than this. Government is forbidden to cast an approving look, or give an encouraging wink to any. Janus like, she must have a blank face for all, and a beating heart for none. Neither does this view confine itself to those among whom we might naturally expect to meet with it; but even many among the more populous christian denominations of the land, are so far under the influence of the modern spirit of *liberality*, as to share the sentiment upon the ground of neutrality, with those who entertain and press it from hostility to all religion. At first view this fact may excite surprise. We do not wonder at non-religionists, and sceptics, and neutralists, occupying the position which they maintain in this matter; for it is natural that their desires would be the parent of such a conviction, and that they should endeavor accordingly to propagate their progeny by exciting similar desires in others. As little are we surprised that the smaller religious sects of the land, especially those not christian, or if nominally christian openly hostile to the fundamental tenets of evangelical christianity, should find pleasure in such a political doctrine, and aid in spreading it; for it demands more moral heroism than is apt to be found, apart from true christian principles sincerely cherished, to sacrifice bigoted attachment to a religious creed to the public good, *even when intellectual prejudices have been so far overcome as to enable men to see that such a sacrifice is really required.* Even though, therefore, Jews and Turks, and Papists, hold it as a settled religious principle, that political well-being and stability demands the recognition of Religion, in the truest form known, on the part of the State; and even though intellectually they might be convinced that it would be far better for the General and Special Governments of our country, so far to acknowledge

their allegiance to Almighty God as to recognize, and revere, by express enactments, the Religious Principles most prevalent when the Government was founded, and the constitutions framed, or those at present entertained by the largest portion of the population; it can hardly be expected that their warmest patriotism will ever induce them frankly to admit this, much less cordially to unite in endeavoring to have such an opinion generally to prevail.

On the contrary, so far as the subject is at all agitated, or made the incidental topic of conversation, every thing that is said is calculated, as no doubt it is designed, to produce the opposite impression. Hence whatever foreign tourists, visiting our country for literary, social and political purposes, may hear, in reference to the vast number of religious denominations,—the zeal, activity, piety, and benevolence of American Churches, and especially their influence, in their separate capacity, upon the social and moral character of the country,—they are sure to be impressed with the idea, that the United States, as a political fabric, holds in utter abhorrence the prevailing European doctrine concerning the union of Church and State. And this too in the sense, that our Government knows nothing of religion in any form, excepting the right of all religions to full untrammelled toleration. And the reports of foreign travellers among us, fully agree with this prevailing conviction. So that in the view of the rest of the world we occupy, shall we say the enviable or unenviable reputation, of being founded, and managed, as a Government, upon constitutions, and by laws, which glory in excluding all recognition of Religion in any form. What an argument is hereby put into the mouths of the enemies of God and Religion, in view of the present prosperity and flattering prospects of a Republic thus established and maintained! But upon what grounds does this doctrine rest? For what reasons are these convictions or conceits, so fondly cherished? A candid consideration of these inquiries must serve, we think, to explode the doctrine, and expose the utter fallacy of the arguments by which it is defended.

The substance of what has commonly been urged in maintenance of this view, and in opposition to those who have contended for the contrary opinion, may be stated in the following points. 1. The office of civil government is purely and exclusively political. 2. No just medium can be found, or long maintained by civil government, between recognizing religious principles, and committing itself to the special protection and support of some particular religious organization. 3. All clas-

all of citizens have equal claims upon the Government for protection and favor, without the least reference to their religious tenets. 4. Hence Government dare not recognize any form of Religion or system of religious truth whatever. And finally, 5. This is the view entertained by the original founders of our Republic, and the several Commonwealths composing it, as is proven by their history, and the constitutions framed for their government. This we believe is a full and fair statement of the case, as argued by those whose doctrine we have now under consideration. Let us take up each of these points separately, and see whether they really possess the force attributed to them, and "carry the irresistible energy of truth."

It is affirmed in the first place that *the office of civil government is purely and exclusively political, and therefore the Government may not intermeddle with matters of Religion*. This is the pivot upon which the Report already quoted turns. The sentiment was quickly snatched up and has been reiterated by others, with the addition of some rhetorical ornaments. "Civil government," says one writer upon the subject "is intended for the regulation of social man—for the promotion and security of human happiness here on earth. It is intended for this world, not for the next. It should protect us in the enjoyment of our personal rights and property. It should not interfere with our opinions and faith. Its business is with our temporal or present interests, not with our future or eternal welfare. * * * Civil government should regulate the duty of man towards man. It should not interfere with the relations between man and his Creator. *Offences against society should be punished by society! Offences against God should be left to God!* It argues great folly, as well as impiety, to suppose the Deity so weak as to require aid from society, or so negligent as to suffer offenders to escape with impunity! *Deorum injuriæ diis curiæ*, was the wise and humble maxim of Pagans." This is so fair a specimen of the mode of reasoning employed in support of this view, that additional quotations would be superfluous. And surely no one would desire assertions so absurd and flat, to be introduced in more than one form in the same article! Who has ever thought of denying that the *primary* office of civil government, is to regulate the affairs of civil society? But who, on the other hand, excepting such as may sympathise with the writer of the above, in his brain-bewildering fears of ecclesiastical tyranny, has ever dreamed of so utterly unqualified a repudiation of the relations of civil government to morality and God? If these are the great arguments, by which alone the advocates of an

ecclesiastical establishment can be met, and their bad politics refuted, we fear that our citizens and legislators will no sooner get rid of educational and political prejudices, and awake to a due exercise of reason, than they will at once raise voice and hand in favor of a union of Church and State. Can it be, that our political captains and standard-bearers have no better weapons, with which to repel the alarming encroachments of spiritual ambition, and ecclesiastical usurpation !

Very different from this is the doctrine our fathers have taught us, touching the nature and relations of civil government. Government, if their creed is correct, and has been rightly understood, is the just application of a system of polity, adopted by a nation or state, to the civil and social wants of its citizens. It rests upon the existence of a written, or tacitly assumed, code of laws or constitution, regulating all its actions. The Government of a country therefore is its Constitution in action, the actualization of its laws, in their regulation of the civil interests of the State, through the lawfully appointed administration. All this now necessarily presupposes the existence of a community or society of people, who have agreed, for their mutual protection and well-being, to form themselves into a civil organization, a body politic, under a common constitution and code of laws. This civil organization however cannot be regarded as the offspring of mere accidental aggregation or agreement. It is as really the result of a sense of moral and social wants, as hunting, and tilling the ground, are attributable to a sense of bodily wants, or as the contrivance of weapons of warfare and defence is to be traced to a consciousness of danger, or a spirit of aggression. Not of course that a full and clear conception of the precise nature of all man's social necessities, has been possessed in every case from the start ; any more than when men first applied themselves to letters, they had a complete view of all their intellectual wants and capabilities. Still a sense of the moral and social relations, in which men find themselves involved by their natural constitution, must be admitted as the primary motive, urging to the formation of such social compacts. Civil government consequently, finds its first root in the moral and social constitution of man. It is the natural, and, if faithful to its office, the legitimate product of his moral and social wants. " The end of its institution maintenance, and administration, should be to render secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity their natural rights, and the blessings of life. * * The body politic is a so-

cial compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good. * * * Among the natural and inalienable rights of men may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

Such being the source and aim of political organizations and of civil governments, it follows beyond contradiction, that just in proportion as the State and its government approximate more perfectly to the legitimate end of their existence, they will make the most complete and equitable provision, for all the moral and social wants of the citizens comprised within their limits. Indeed as the offspring of the people thus united in a civil compact, and as the organ of their united convictions, desires, and will, the people themselves, will demand of the Government such provisions, in proportion as they become conscious of their need of them. And the Government is bound to acquiesce in these requisitions, or resign its office, unless this may be held upon other conditions than those above assumed.

If therefore civil government, in so far as it is of human origin, is the creature of the people uniting under it, and if, by their own confession, its professed object is to make adequate provision for their relative moral and for their social wants, it may certainly be expected that the higher and more important these wants are, the more ready and anxious will they be that their government should endeavor to have them fully met. Having felt themselves socially and morally constrained, to combine in such general organizations, in order the better to secure and promote their well-being and happiness, as a community of moral and social beings, they must assuredly feel equally constrained, now that they have entered into such a compact, to make constitutional and efficient provision, adequate to the end proposed.

But has religion nothing to do with the social and political, not to say moral well-being and happiness of a State? Is it a matter of perfect indifference to a Government, what views and principles prevail among its citizens, in reference to religion? Can it be of no concern to our Congress, or to our State Legislatures, considered as purely political bodies, whether the religion of our citizens is becoming predominantly Mahomedan, or Patagonian, or Chinese? Would they be true to their honest convictions of what is required by the real well-being of the nation or state, or of what their constituents at large believe to be required by it, by admitting and tolerating either or all of

these, or as many others, of like stamp, as might sue for admission to the union, and crave its privileges and protection? Or, to get a step nearer the source of government, consider the case in view of those from whom the State and its constitution have sprung, the people. Assume them to be predominantly christian. As such they acknowledge their dependence upon God, and their allegiance to Him. They receive the Holy Scriptures as His revealed will, and confess their subjection to them as their highest moral code. In a word they acknowledge that all their dearest and most sacred interests are in inseparable connection with their religious character and duties. How now can those possessed of such convictions be expected to lay them all aside, and utterly disregard them, when they resolve themselves into a national community? It may be safely submitted to the impartial judgment even of those who deny the right of Government to interfere with religious principles, to say, whether a people, holding and avowing such views as these, could, without the greatest inconsistency and an utter repudiation of their own creed, go deliberately to work, organize a government, frame a constitution, and enact laws, and in the whole transaction not admit a single sentence in favor of any religious principles? And yet this is what their theory demands. Here is a constitution and government formed under circumstances answering strictly to the case supposed. The people originating and sustaining it were and are predominantly Christian at least, not to define their religion more closely, but they must give no hint of this in their political acts. They believe in Almighty God, and hold that He is the Great Governor of men and nations, but must not acknowledge their national allegiance to Him lest they should trench illiberally upon the theology of some polytheistic, or atheistic citizen. They are fully satisfied that there is no element, which can mix in with the components of the national existence, so potent for good or evil as the religious, and yet must not suffer a single letter of their constitution, or the smallest item of their legal code, to give the slightest intimation of this conviction, lest they should thereby violate the sacred rights of conscience. Laws may be enacted, altered, and amended, at pleasure, to regulate commerce, agriculture, and the arts, but no law or by-law, nothing that the nation does or can do, must say, even most darkly, whether it believes in one God or a thousand, whether it receives the Bible or the Koran, as His revelation. For if the Government undertakes to define its religious position even in the least iota, it departs, according to this theory, from its legitimate functions, and converts itself into a theo-

logical tribunal, becomes inevitably involved in all the bitter controversies of the church, and may be expected to play on in the religious drama, until the last scene closes with a general *auto da fe*!

Now there is one thing about this theory which makes it less dangerous than it would otherwise be, namely that it refutes itself. It need only speak out its views distinctly, in order to utter a sentence of self-condemnation. For it is surely self-evident that it demands a natural and moral impossibility, as well as a complete sacrifice of all religious fidelity. Such a disruption of the social and moral, from the religious nature of man as it requires, cannot be conceived of, apart from the most violent injustice to his whole being. Man cannot be a servant of God as a man, and an atheist as a citizen. His religious and social nature being both derived from God, they can both find their true life only in Him. The two inseparately interpenetrate each other, and cannot prosper in a political divorcement.

The theory under consideration assumes that Religion and Civil Government issue from totally different sources. This is its grand mistake. Under the influence of this fundamental error, the advocates of the theory get more widely out of the way, as they advance in their argument. Religion and Civil Government on the contrary have both but one origin, flow from the same divine source. They are twin sisters of celestial birth. In reference to Religion this will of course be admitted as the only rational view of its origin. But this view is also the only proper and secure ultimate basis of Civil Government. However variant the *forms* of Government may be, accordingly as the peculiar circumstances out of which they may temporarily have sprung may differ, Government itself is as really the result of a divinely implanted constitution in the human race, as is Religion. For just as one of the two primary facts upon which the existence of Religion among men rests, is man's natural capability of knowing, loving, and serving God, (the possession of which most clearly indicates the highest design of man's creation), so the deepest and last reason which can be assigned for the existence of Civil Government, is to be found alone in that social and moral nature with which the Creator has endowed man, and which cannot thrive or ripen to full development excepting within its genial sphere. In our country indeed this is generally admitted, though under a different form, when it is affirmed, as the broad foundation of all free governments, that all men are *created* with certain and equal inalienable rights, thus appealing, for the righteousness of the claims urged, to the

expressed will of the Creator. No sooner therefore is this admission made, than the view for which we are contending follows as a necessary inference. Men in their combined civil capacity cannot divest themselves of the responsibilities and duties which devolve upon them as individuals. If they have faith in God at all, if they ever cherish hearty reverence for Him, they cannot lay aside these strongest and holiest feelings of their souls, just then when they are about to engage in one of the most momentous and solemn duties they can ever be summoned to discharge. But if they cannot consistently do this, and should never be asked to do it, surely they must be allowed to give their constitution and laws so much of a religious character as will indicate, though in a very general way yet unequivocally, whether they are a Christian or a Pagan people, worshippers of the Sun or of Him who made it.

Civil Government therefore can no more divest itself of its divine genealogy and obligations, than can the intelligent and moral agents constituting it get rid of their's. However closely it may confine itself to the legitimate sphere of its political duties, yet as even the politics of such a people cannot utterly exclude Religion, or prosper independently of its help, so it cannot be inconsistent for Government to discharge its civil offices with conscientious reference to its religious responsibilities.

It is by no means denied hereby that the duties of Civil Government are pre-eminently political. There can be no objection even to admitting that they are exclusively so, if by exclusively be understood the shutting out simply of all that can be excluded without detriment to the true political interests of the State. But we must protest against the inference often drawn from this premise, viz: that Government may not at all meddle with matters which concern Religion. And surely the advocates of this view cannot be in earnest, when they attempt to sustain it by such theology as is taught in the quotations made on a previous page! Since however it is the best that is offered, let us examine it somewhat more minutely.

"Civil Government," it is said, "is intended for the regulation of social man, for the promotion and security of human happiness here on earth." A very exalted and rational view of the great design of political institutions. But for this very reason it must exclude the inference which it is intended should be drawn therefrom. On the contrary so long as religion remains the purest and highest source of social happiness, and so long as its principles continue to be the preserving salt of human society, so long must Civil Government seek in some way to propitiate

her favor, and secure the blessings of a perpetual abode of Religion in its midst. Or would the advocates of the opposite view persuade us that Religion has nothing to do with social man, or with the promotion and perpetuation of human happiness on earth! It would almost seem so from the tenor of the second period in the above quotations. It affirms that Government "is intended for this world, not for the next;" therefore again can have nothing to do with matters involving religion! And why this? Because Religion has nothing to do with men's temporal or terrestrial relations? For aught that appears to the contrary, this is the doctrine taught. But assuredly no christian writer could advocate such views!

Again it is admitted that it is the duty of Civil Government to "protect us in the enjoyment of our personal rights and property." Now one of the holiest and dearest rights of a christian man, or a christian community, is to avow their faith in God, and their submission to His revealed will. This constitutes for them the highest blessing of civil liberty. But if Civil Government secure to them these rights, it must of necessity allow them the exercise of their religious prerogative in their civil relations, and thus become unavoidably involved in matters of religion.

So again when it said that the business of Civil Government is with our temporal interests, that it should regulate the duty of man towards man, and punish offences against society; unless Religion is denied all participation in these things, it must be granted, that these duties of Civil Government, instead of forbidding its association with Religion, really demand that it should in some way recognize it, and legislate with reference to its established principles.

But we are reluctant further to pursue a theological path so crooked and tangled as this. Neither does the case require it. For until it is shown that civil society can divest itself of the religious character and responsibilities of its individual members, or that God has nothing to do with moral agents in their civil or national capacity, it may be triumphantly maintained, that Civil Government cannot and should not be kept wholly asunder from Religion. And still further, until it is demonstrated, that a political organization can dispense with all moral regulations, or that it may devise and adopt some other moral code than that derived from the sacred books of Christianity, it must be conceded, that by mainly adopting the principles of this code, it unavoidably commits itself in favor of that Religion to which the code belongs. So that in whatever aspect of the subject we may select, we receive the same impressions. The very idea of

Civil Government as a political institution, involves it with Religion in some form or other. No political surgery can sever the bonds uniting them without at least fatally maiming the former, if not periling its very existence.'

Another objection to this view, and an additional reason for requiring Civil Government to keep itself entirely separate from Religion, is supposed to be found in *the inseparable difficulty of maintaining a proper position in reference to matters of religious faith and practice.* Even if the propriety of making some general acknowledgements were yielded, it is contended that Government could not remain with this, but would find itself gradually yet irresistibly impelled onward to something more. For however general and liberal the admissions first made might be, it is affirmed that they would be the entering wedge of more special and particular concessions. Thus the Government would be, slowly perhaps but surely, implicated in favor of the religious tenets of some particular denomination of the land, and thereby give it the first impulse to political ascendancy. And inasmuch as all history unites in testifying to the aggressive spirit of ecclesiastical organizations, and mournfully exemplifies their thirst after political influence, and their frequent abuse of it when it has once been obtained, political prudence is supposed to dictate the expediency of forestalling the evil by checking first attempts.

The misfortunes and misdoings of the Church, in connection with the political speculations, in which the force of outward circumstances, or the unwise ambition of her more influential leaders, have heretofore involved her, have indeed afforded her enemies, or such as were still more ambitious in another sphere than her aspiring sons, abundant opportunity for declamation and reproach. And of course those who desired to make out a case in their own favor at the expense of the interests of Religion, would not feel called upon to state any of the advantages resulting to the state and to humanity, from these political exploits of the Church, but rather hold them up as always and unmixedly evil. It would not be hard however to find, in the same histories which tell us of the disasters brought upon the State by its political combinations with the Church, evidence showing on the one hand, that the condition of the State might

' See Burlamaqui's "Nat. and Polit. Law," (Nugent's translation) vol. I. P. 2, Chap. II and VI.

Montesquieu's "Spirit of Laws," B. 24, 25, 26.

Vattel's "Law of Nations," B. I, Chap. 3, and 12.

have been still worse but for this combination, and on the other that the Church, even in its meekest and most spiritual times, suffered indescribably more evil from the State than ever she inflicted upon it. Neither should all the blame be cast upon the Church, if cunning politicians, finding their usual foot-hold failing them, craftily betook themselves to her foundations, and by a skilful appropriation of the material there obtained, erected a politico-religious fabrick, of which they might have the supreme command, and so retrieve their ruined fortunes.

And yet we are free to admit that the evils of national ecclesiastical establishments cannot be easily exaggerated. Our sympathies are strongly with those who hold them in hearty abhorrence. The disasters, both for Church and State, which have been connected with them in ages past, are a clear indication of the mind of God concerning them, and practically prove, that Christ will not have His kingdom to be of this world. Above all the Church has nothing to gain, and every thing to hazard from such combinations. So long as society remains in its present mixed and imperfect condition, Civil Government and the Church are not prepared for the consummation of those nuptial joys in which they are destined to be ultimately united.

All this however may be admitted without involving assent to the objection now under review. This objection is based upon an oversight or denial of a well-defined and generally admitted fact, in reference to the relation subsisting between general religious principles, and religious organizations, based upon these principles, and constituted by those agreeing in faith, for their maintenance and propagation. It is assumed that this relation is so intimate, as that the holding of religious principles must necessarily and hastily lead to the formation of religious societies. But this is a manifest fallacy. How many in every community, who hold to the existence of God, acknowledge the divine authority of the sacred scriptures, and in a word assent to all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, who yet are never led to unite even with already existing religious societies. But *are* they, or are they *thought* infidels or atheists on this account? Assuredly not, however heartily it may be regretted, for their own sakes, that they persist in their refusal to do more than merely assent intellectually to the main principles of the christian creed. Or are persons of this description supposed to be committed to any denominational interests, because they *avow* such assent? Does their acknowledging these general and self-evident christian truths, convert them into Presbyterians, or Episcopalians, Reformed, Lutherans or Methodists? By no

means. Neither would a similar acknowledgment on the part of the State, involve it in denominational favoritism, or expose it to the danger of being finally clogged with an ecclesiastical establishment. Indeed it no more follows, that such concessions on the part of the State implies a tendency to its ultimate union with the Church, than that the avowal on the part of our general government, of certain broad, and commonly received political principles, necessarily involves a tendency to interference on the part of the National with the State Governments. What, for instance, has the general government of the United States to do with the private rights, and personal prerogatives of the citizens of the several confederate States? It is well known with how much jealousy the movements of the National Legislature are watched, in reference to aught that inclines to interference with State rights. And yet no one has ever thought of complaining at the avowal of the great first principles of political orthodoxy, set forth in the glorious Declaration of Independence, and reiterated a thousand times since. Perfect security is felt in the solemn guaranty of the National Constitution that no such interference shall ever be attempted. So too might the nation be made to feel equally secure against the future introduction of a General Church Establishment, even though the National Constitution might avow, or silently assume the cardinal doctrines of revealed religion. Altogether therefore the apprehension that such an avowal, on the part of the State, would necessarily be the first step towards an ultimate union of Church and State, must be dismissed as unfounded and absurd. There is as much reason to apprehend a combination of the National Government with the American Temperance Union, for the purpose of making its principles the religion of the land. What christian denomination would be favored or patronized by such an avowal of religious truth as the objectors would forbid? What denomination can claim God as exclusively its Lord? Whose Bible are the sacred Scriptures? Which is distinguished by holding more than the rest, to man's moral accountability? These questions require no answer. And yet the apprehensions of the objectors anticipate such changes in the religious, or rather denominational interests of our country, as are far less likely to occur, than a dissolving of the State Government, into one consolidated confederacy. For before ever the fears entertained or affected with reference to this result, can be realized, some one of the many christian persuasions found among us must have so swollen its population, as to be able to prevail at the ballot-box, or in the battle-field, against the combined strength

of all the rest, backed by myriads of non-religionists always ready to join in the resistance of ecclesiastical ambition. In deed according to the rule of human probabilities, there is far more reason to fear that our civil and religious liberties may, at no very distant day, become a prey to the devouring fury of rabid infidelity; or the gorging ambition of political demagogues, than suffer harm in a single interest from the aspirations of the Christian Church. Before any existing or imaginary form of Religion can become dominant here, or secure its temporal aggrandizement by being elevated to the dignity and prerogatives of a National Church, greater violence must be done to the General and State constitutions and laws, deeper and stronger prejudices be overcome in the national mind and heart, and altogether a mightier revolution take place in all the political and religious convictions of the great mass of our citizens, than there are any rational grounds for anticipating. In order therefore to quell those rising fears of ecclesiastical usurpation, or shame them out of the mind, it is only necessary to consider how few of the fifteen millions of Protestants of our land, or even of the two millions of Roman Catholics, could be found to favor any attempts that might be contemplated in this direction; and still more how earnestly the millions that have no sympathy with the Church, would contend, to the last extremity of resistance, against the execution of such a scheme.

This objection therefore forms no valid reason why our civil government should not avow its belief in the cardinal principles of the Christian Religion.

But *would not the Government be thus involved in an interference with the religious views and convictions of its individual citizens?* As is well known almost every variety of religious opinion exists among us. Independently of the diversity of sentiment prevailing among those who are not identified with any religious profession or creed, our nominally christian population is distributed among some fifty already existent denominations, numbering each from a few millions to a few tens of members, and are continually subdividing into others ever new appearing. Besides these we have among us not a few Jews, some thousands of Indians, and possibly a dozen or two Mohammedans. To all these now, it is said the Government has guaranteed equal civil and religious rights. It is solemnly pledged to extend the strong arm of political protection over all alike. As a Government they are all equally its citizens, and as citizens should all be equally esteemed. All therefore may claim protection in the free enjoyment and exercise of their re-

ligious convictions and worship, whatever they may be, so long as these do not jeopardize or discommode the rights of others.

Certainly no one would think of questioning a word of this, or denying the rights thus claimed on behalf of every citizen of the land. But what has all this to do with the inference to be drawn from it? How would it interfere with any of these rights for the Government to do all that we believe to be desirable, and that we hold her bound to do according to the positions maintained in answer to the first objection? Is there a Jew or Greek, or Turk, or Indian in the land, who would or could justly complain, if our National or our State Constitutions expressed assent to the doctrine of God's existence, or of His sovereignty and universal Providence? Might they not all enjoy their several religions, without the least molestation, even if Government avowed itself, in some such general way, favorable to the leading tenets of Christianity? Would the Turk be constrained to love the Koran less, because the Government revered the Bible more? Would the Israelite's faith in Moses and the Prophets be at all infringed upon, because our national code believed besides in Christ and the Apostles? Would it require them to chant less joyfully, or to pray with suppressed fervor?

The objection assumes more than the premises allow. Government does indeed guarantee to every citizen, protection in the enjoyment of his religious rights, non-interference with his religious convictions. And this guaranty should be kept inviolate. But does Government hereby surrender her right, or betray her duty, to recognize the fundamental doctrines of that system of religion which is most heartily believed to be the true one? Before ever the followers of Mohammed, or the disciples of Zoroaster or of Fo select this country for their abode, they know its predominant religious character, and are assured by our laws of nothing more than protection in the enjoyment of their religious rights. More than this they have no right to demand, and no reason to expect. If they choose to make a christian land their country and their home, they can certainly not require it to study all their sacred folios in order carefully to avoid offending them by enactments impliedly prejudicial to their private religious fancies. Otherwise our legislators would need to acquaint themselves very minutely with the mysteries of solar theology, and the hidden secrets of astrology, before they could venture to prepare a single report, or draw up one act for adoption. But the truth is, that excepting in the case of the denominations of Sabbatarians, no religious community, has ever dreamed of urging a complaint against the favor thus indirectly shown

to Christianity, by its recognition of some general religious truths. Whatever complaints have been made in the case, have come from those rather, who care as little for Mohammed as for Moses, and far less for both than for *themselves*.

This then brings us to the real point of difficulty in this whole argument. When the undisguised truth is spoken, it will reveal the fact, that the restless and radical spirit of Infidelity, in its variously assumed forms, is the underground volcanic cause, of whatever commotion may agitate the public mind upon this important question. The controversy is not and never has been between the different religious denominations of the land. They almost universally agree in sentiment upon this subject. Strong as their sectarian prejudices may be, and mournful as their mutual jealousies may have been, they are strangers to any serious fears that either might by any possibility become the reigning religion of the Nation. The petitions which gave rise to the Sunday Mail's Report furnish satisfactory proof of this.

The great question then to be decided in this case is, *whether the obligations of civil government to Infidelity and Irreligion, or to the religious Indifferentism of the land, are such as to forbid its avowal of belief in certain general religious tenets.* This question, it is trusted, need not long remain unanswered. In point of fact we shall soon see that our Government has unequivocally answered it already. And but little reflection is required to convince all open to conviction, that the course thus pursued is in full agreement with every principle of equity and moral right. For the demands of Infidelity, and of those who ask that nothing may be intimated or done by the State which shall affect their opinions of religion, are manifestly such as Government cannot comply with, without transgressing those very limits of neutrality within which she is required to confine herself. For if the Creator of the world is the legitimate Sovereign of all its intelligent and moral inhabitants, and if His Divine Sovereignty extends not only to men in their individual capacity, but to communities and nations, then the duty of a Government with reference to a formal recognition of this Sovereignty is undeniable. Whenever therefore such a recognition is withheld, or upon such political grounds as have already been assigned is pronounced inexpedient and inconsistent with the spirit of free institutions, the doctrine of the Divine Supremacy is virtually repudiated, a silent decision is passed in favor of atheism, or of deism, and thus again the Government betrayed into a transgression of the very limits by which liberalists would have its actions bounded.

In this dilemma then it is for Government to choose its alternative, by those rules which truth, justice, and profound wisdom may dictate. Seeing the impossibility of maintaining such neutrality as some demand, it must decide upon the relative merits of these conflicting claims in view of their bearing upon the true well-being of the country. If Infidelity and Irreligion are honestly believed to be more salutary to a nation than Christianity, if their prevalence, according to the testimony of past history, and present facts, is more likely to promote our political prosperity, if in proportion as our citizens become infidel or deistic we may expect the nation at large to advance in intelligence, in virtue, and in social happiness, why then Government, *as a purely civil institution*, might feel itself called upon to cast the weight of its moral influence into the scale of atheism. On the contrary, however, if there is good reason to believe that Government owes more of its past success, and present prosperity to the various moral and social influences exerted by christianity, than to any other source,—that the future condition of the nation will be flourishing only in proportion as her citizens are pervaded and governed by the spirit of that religion,—and finally that the highest civil and social interests of the union are vitally bound up with those of christianity, then, *upon the same purely political grounds*, must the Government feel bound to avow itself a christian government.

To those who are aware of the looseness of the prevailing popular opinions upon this subject, and of the craft and diligence, with which many who are hostile to the christian religion and the church, are endeavoring to have those nominally liberal sentiments confirmed in the popular mind, no apology need be offered for the space which has been devoted to the consideration of its more abstract merits. However self-evident the positions we have assumed may seem to be to some, the truth is that they are often virtually and practically surrendered as erroneous. It is to be feared that not a few of our best and most virtuous citizens, have, without due reflection, let themselves be betrayed into the belief, that the maxim, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," really means, that Caesar has nothing to do with God. Hoodwinked by the sophistry of those who represent Divine truths and religious organizations as always and inseparably connected, they have permitted themselves to be hurried into the persuasion, that the Civil Government had better avoid all reference to religion. The pernicious tendency of this false political theology must be manifest upon the least earnest consideration. Instead therefore

of at once yielding to its plausible appeals, its progress should be anxiously watched. It has no right to demand unhesitating assent to its bold and novel assumptions. Least of all have the true friends of religion a right to yield unthinkingly to its impious demands. They should not fear the imputation of bigotry, or superstition, because they choose to require good reasons for embracing the views which it is attempted so hastily to force upon them. It is surely as commendable to be firm in adhering to the old and tried maxims of our fathers, as to be reckless in espousing the irreligious fancies of modern liberalists. As yet our political institutions may be safe. There are however omens sufficiently portentous of future evil, issuing from the very quarter from which this doctrine of non-government-religion proceeds, to wake up the slumbering friends of true civil order and social well-being, to suspicious vigilance. These omens should not be disregarded. It is far easier to retain sound principles now held upon this subject, than it would be to recover them when once lost.

Leaving then these general considerations, let us pass on to inquire briefly, into *the relation which our political institutions actually sustain to religion*. It has already been shown that there are two leading forms in which a Government may be related to Religion, the one by a formal union of the State with some ecclesiastical establishment, the other by a mere recognition, on the part of the State, of the fundamental doctrines of the true religion, and its general principles of morality. We have also seen that the latter by no means involves the former, nor yet a necessary tendency that way. Now it is in the latter respect alone that we maintain that our Government is committed in favor of that system of religion which characterizes *Protestant evangelical christianity*.

There are two main sources to which we must look for whatever evidence may be needed upon this subject. The first is to the action of the nation in its confederate capacity. This, in view of the peculiar relation sustained by the General to the State Government, must be expected to be very indefinite in a case like this. The second and more important source is the Constitutions and Laws of the several Commonwealths comprising the Republic.

Both these sources now furnish, in the first place, the most satisfactory evidence that our civil government does not discard, but most sincerely recognizes and respects religion in some of its leading principles.

Of this we find remarkably clear proof already in that great

and imperishable document from the adoption and issue of which our Republic dates its birth. In the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, the representatives of the Colonies, then already virtually sundered from the British government, and acting in the capacity of an independent Nation, avowed in the name of their constituents, their faith in a personal self-subsistent God, as the author of nature's laws, and yet himself distinct from and exalted above nature. The next paragraph opens with an explicit statement of this, among other "self-evident truths," viz : that this God of nature is the Creator of man, and that man as the creature can lay claim to no other rights than those with which his Maker has endowed him. "All men are created, * *, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." In a subsequent period the *great doctrine of revealed religion touching the moral accountability of the creature to the Creator, and more especially of political governments to the King of kings* is adopted with most solemn emphasis. It is contained in that earnest and devout appeal with which the Declaration closes. "We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, *appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, &c., &c.* And, for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance *on the protection of Divine Providence*, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." When the circumstances under which this Declaration was made are duly considered, the avowal of sentiments like these, and at such a time, must be allowed to be deeply significant. They are a most solemn pledge to the christian world at large, that the Government about to be established may be justly reckoned a friend of religion. If they are any thing more than the hypocritical flourish of pious professions, introduced for the purpose of propitiating the favor of christianity, they undoubtedly obligate the nation to the maintenance of so much of the christian system as they avow. That this was designed is self-evident, and being so proves that the *intention* of the nation at the start was, not by any means to establish a Government which should be utterly independent of religion or indifferent to it, but one which should forever acknowledge God, and virtually maintain and promote the *great fundamental truths of revealed religion*. It is only in this view of the case, that we can at all fairly account for the fact, that in a document, which might very readily have excluded every allusion to religious sentiments, so many should be so distinctly announced.

In refutation however of all this, the position taken in the Constitution of the United States, might be appealed to, to prove that such an intention as is assumed above, is plainly repudiated, if it ever had been entertained. That position may be regarded as not simply neutral, but decidedly negative in its character. For when it provides, (Art. VI. Sect. 3), that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and again (Amend. Art. I.) enacts, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" it does appear as though, in over anxiety to forestall any inclination even to the establishment of a national church, all recognition of religion under any form were studiously avoided. This, we are free to confess, is a remarkable feature in an instrument framed for the government of such a nation, and at such a time. It would indeed seem as though the solemn vow, previously made in a season of trouble, had been wholly forgotten. The contrast, in this respect, between the Declaration of Independence and this Constitution, is humiliating and painful. The appeal made to the King of kings in the former, followed by ten thousand fervent supplications from an afflicted struggling people, was not unavailing. But we look in vain in this great Charter, in which that Declaration found its happy consummation, for a counterpart to that appeal. How shall this painful incongruity be reconciled! That the defect of the Constitution in this respect, was deeply felt and deplored, at the time of its adoption, is well known. It was however not so easy to remedy the evil as to feel it. Numerous as were the sincere friends of religion, in the Convention of '87, and heartily as they may have desired that at least some general acknowledgement of the great principles of christianity should be made, it would have been hazardous to all the interests at stake, to attempt the introduction of the subject under the circumstances then existing. For there were a few members, headed by Jefferson, who would have opposed the attempt to the last. It was not by accident that he had omitted all reference to religion in a positive way, in the first draft of the instrument; and it would not have been easy to gain his consent or that of his friends, to its introduction afterwards. This therefore may be classed among those things in the Constitution of which the immortal Washington says: "I readily acknowledge they never did, and I am persuaded never will, obtain my cordial approbation; but I did then conceive, and do now most firmly believe, that in the aggregate, it is the best constitution that can be obtained at this epoch, and

that this, or a dissolution, awaits our choice, and is the only alternative."

Whilst however candor requires us to make these concessions, justice demands that this peculiarity of the National Constitution should not be forced in as evidence of what it by no means proves. For the fact dare not be overlooked, that it was in no sense the province of the National Constitution or Government to make provision for the moral and religious wants of the citizens of the Republic. This duty belonged to the Legislatures of the several States. Neither would these have been disposed to allow of such an apparent interference with their Sovereign Authority, even in favor of religion, lest advantage might be taken of the precedent to do so in other matters.

Besides this, the Constitution is to be considered as rather *assuming the truth* of the christian religion, than legislating against it. This had been openly and avowedly the religion of the Colonies. It was universally known to be that of all the Representatives, with but a very few exceptions. The laws of the nation, as administered at the time of its adoption, were uniformly administered upon this assumption. It was countenanced, and approved, in a most decided form, in the daily devotions with which the Congress was opened. So that all that was deemed necessary, was a guaranty to the States from the General Government, that no sectarian or denominational tenets, or form of religion, should ever be made a test of qualification for office, or be fastened upon the Republic as a National Religion. The States were individually to be left at full liberty, in this respect to exercise their elective rights. Not however at liberty to elect at pleasure a Turk or a Pagan. For it was as confidently presumed that such an exercise of their liberty would not be attempted, as that it was taken for granted that no State would send an idiot or a madman to represent her in the National Legislature. But as the moral and general religious character of the States were known, sufficient confidence was felt in the good sense, and moral integrity of the citizens of the States, to silence all fears, that any choice repugnant to the prevailing sympathies and convictions of the nation, would be carefully and conscientiously avoided. And past experience has proven, this confidence not to have been misplaced. Whatever at times may have been the warmth of party feeling, and the bitterness of sectarian prejudice, the religious principles of the great majority of our National Legislators, have altogether been as decidedly christian, as those of the members of the English Parliament, notwithstanding the influence of their ecclesiastical establishment.

The view now taken of the true position of the National Constitution is by no means new. It is taught and ably advocated by the most distinguished Jurists and Statesmen of our land. A single quotation from the Commentary of Chief Justice Story will show that it has his full sanction. In his comment upon the amendments Art. I. he says: "The right of a society or government to interfere in matters of religion will hardly be contested by any persons who believe that piety, religion and morality are intimately connected with the well-being of the State, and indispensable to the administration of civil justice. The promulgation of the great doctrines of religion; the being, and attributes, and providence of one Almighty God; the responsibility to Him for all our actions, founded upon moral freedom and accountability; a future state of rewards and punishment; the cultivation of all the personal, social and benevolent virtues;—these never can be a matter of indifference in any well ordered community. It is, indeed, difficult to conceive, how any civilized society can well exist without them. And at all events it is impossible for those, who believe in the truth of christianity, as a divine revelation, to doubt that it is the especial duty of Government to foster and encourage it among all the citizens and subjects. This is a point wholly distinct from that of the right of private judgement in matters of religion, and of the freedom of public worship according to the dictates of one's own conscience."

"Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it, now under consideration, the general, if not the universal sentiment in America was, that christianity ought to receive encouragement from the State, so far as it is not incompatible with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of religious worship."

"The real object of the amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahommedanism or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government."

It is however mainly to the State constitutions and laws that we must look for the most direct evidence in this case. To those belong properly the duty and right of making such provision for the religious and moral wants of society as may be thought expedient. The definite and decided tone of the majority of these, now, will be found to compensate very amply, for the apparent deficiency of the national constitution. In all the

constitutions of the several States, we find the existence and Providence of Almighty God, the accountability of man, and the institution and importance of religion in the forms under which it is known in the commonwealth, explicitly recognized; whilst some of them speak out still more decidedly and by name in favor of the christian religion. Our limits forbid the quotation of passages from the whole of them in proof of this, and should a selection be made it might be thought partial. It will be better therefore to refer the reader to those documents themselves, that each one may for himself judge of their import. And we feel confident that if they are carefully and impartially examined, they will convince every candid mind, that those who framed and adopted them, honestly intended to avow themselves and their several States, the decided friends of the christian religion, so far as this could be done without infringing upon the reasonable rights and convictions of others. Neither will any fair construction of the prohibitions, which most of them contain, against the establishment of a State Church, interpret them as a disavowal of such religious faith, or preference.

If on the other hand we turn to the legal codes of the States, it will be seen that they all assume it as a point fully settled that christianity is the religion of the State. In proof of this many pages of the most pointed testimony might be quoted, but we shall limit ourselves to a few references to the laws of our own State, as a fair specimen of the character of the rest, and as being of most immediate interest to us.

By the laws of Pennsylvania the *Christian Sabbath* is expressly recognized and protected against profanation, and the needless violation of it is punishable, as any other crime, in our courts of justice. Accordingly in the case of the Commonwealth vs. Wolf (a Jew), decided in 1817; and again in that of Specht (a Seventh-day Baptist) vs. the Commonwealth, decided in May 1848, the Supreme Court declare the observance of the Christian Sabbath, by cessation from work, to be binding upon all the citizens of the State, and give verdict against the offenders; and this not upon the ground of a natural but the divine law, as understood by the Christian Church.

Again: under the statutes of Pennsylvania, "whoever shall willfully, premeditatedly, and despitefully blaspheme; and speak loosely and profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the Scriptures of truth, and is legally convicted thereof"—shall be subject to a penalty. The validity of this ancient statute was fairly tested in the case of Updegraff of Pittsburg, in 1824; and the opinion of Judge Duncan upon it is able and

characteristic, and well worthy of a careful perusal. He says among other things equally in point: "The bold ground is taken, though it has often been exploded, and nothing but what is trite can be said upon it—it is a barren soil, upon which no flower ever blossomed;—the assertion is once more made, that christianity never was received as a part of the common law of this christian land; and it is added, that if it was, it was virtually repealed by the Constitution of the United States, and of this State, as inconsistent with the liberty of the people, the freedom of religious worship, and hostile to the genius and spirit of our government. If the argument were worth any thing, all the laws which have christianity for their object—all would be carried away at one fell swoop—the act against cursing and swearing, and breach of the Lord's day; the act forbidding incestuous marriages, perjury by taking a false oath upon the book, * * *, et peccatum illud horribile non nominandum inter christianos—for all these are founded on christianity—all these are restraints upon civil liberty—edicts of religious and civic tyranny, 'when enlightened notions of the rights of man were not so universally diffused as at the present day.' * * * Christianity, general christianity is, and always has been a part of the common law of Pennsylvania."

The prescribed form of oath, as administered in our courts of justice, bears testimony equally clear in favor of this view. This holds especially true of that exceedingly impressive form by the uplifted hand, by which members of the denomination of Covenanters, and others having conscientious objections to the kissing of the evangelists, as a supposed relic of superstition, are adjured. "You do swear by Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, that the evidence which you will give &c.—shall be the truth &c.—and that as you shall answer to God at the great day."

To the same effect is the statute against perjury, resting so manifestly upon a christian foundation, that the import of its testimony will hardly be disputed. With these references then, we may let the proofs afforded by the laws of the land rest, although if it were necessary they might be indefinitely multiplied.

What now is the sum of all this testimony? Here is a Nation, with the first breath of its political existence, proclaiming its faith in God as the Creator, Governor and Judge of the world, and solemnly pledging itself to act in subserviency to His will; prostrating itself in humble supplication at His throne of grace, at which the ordained ministers of Protestant Evangelical Chris-

tian denominations are called to lead it solemn devotions; honoring by special enactments in its favor, and by universal cessation from all national labor, (excepting in one case, in which unavoidable necessity is the professed apology) the Christian Sabbath; covering with the broad shield of statute protection, the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, so that none of its citizens may blaspheme the same with impunity; establishing a christian form of oath; and making, in a word the moral code of christianity, the grand basis of the common law of the land! Is this an infidel Nation? Can scoffers at the christian religion, and indeed at all religion, claim a Government making such professions, and retaining and enforcing such laws, as neutral ground? Is this a Mohammedan Nation? Would any of our courts of justice decide that the statute against blasphemy, meant to protect Mohammed and the Koran against profanity, as much as the Gospel and the Lord Jesus Christ? Is it a Jewish or a Pagan nation, and could its constitutions, and its laws, be plead as impartially favorable to all alike? But if it is manifestly neither of these, by what name shall we designate its religious character? The only answer to this inquiry, corresponding fairly with the facts in the case is—by the title, *Christian, Protestant, Evangelical*.

That the acknowledged and specially favored religion of our nation is *Christian*, in distinction from Jewish, Greek, Mohammedan, and Pagan, will need no further elucidation.

But it is also *Protestant*. The christianity which our constitutions and our laws recognize, and avowedly favor, is that which bears the plain impress of tolerant Protestantism. Indeed they favor and guaranty by express enactment, the most enlarged religious toleration, which is at all consistent with the maintenance of religion under any form. They make every citizen easy and secure in the enjoyment of his convictions, so that each one is free to worship God (but not to blaspheme Him, and revile His word) according to the dictate of his conscience. This now is in blunt opposition to the tyrannical intolerance of the doctrines of Popery, (and wherever circumstances allow it, of its practice too) as also of that phase of nominal Protestantism, which is Popery in disguise. For if decrees of councils, and authorized exponents of doctrine mean any thing, and above all if the testimony of thirty generations, deprived of their religious liberties and personal rights by Papal usurpations, is to be counted worthy of a hearing, Popery is not, and so long as it remains true to its fundamental principles, cannot be otherwise than the implacable foe of civil liberty and spiritual toleration. But this

being so, then so long as the solemn guaranties given in Bills of Rights, and State constitutions, by which the government and their constituents are mutually pledged to the perpetual maintenance of political and religious freedom, are kept inviolate, so long must the United States stand in avowed hostility to the arrogant pretensions of the Vatican. Neither does this at all conflict with the civil privileges enjoyed by Roman Catholic citizens in common with all others. For in the first place a man in this country may be a member of the church bearing that name, and yet not be a Papist, in the strict sense; may be, in reference to his political creed, as truly Republican as the sincerest Protestant. Of such we would fain hope there are many thousands in the land. But even upon the supposition that he is at heart a Papist, he cannot be such to the cognizance of the Government; for before ever he can enjoy the privileges of an American citizen, he must, by oath, renounce all allegiance to the temporal authority of Rome, and bow to the supreme sovereignty of the constitution and laws of the Government. Until therefore the Papacy alters its creed, nay even tears away the very corner-stone of its peculiar ecclesiastico political system, renounces all claims to civil power, acknowledges its past errors in having violently forced upon men its spiritual yoke, and proclaims liberty to men, in the exercise of those civil and moral rights which reason and revelation plainly grant them, it cannot but acknowledge that the predominant spirit of our political institutions, and many of their explicit enactments are in decided hostility to its most prominent peculiarities.

But if, for the reasons assigned, our Government must be denominated *Christian Protestant*, there are also good grounds for further styling it *Evangelical*. Not by any means that we would claim the United States as a champion of some particular form of christian orthodoxy. We have seen on the contrary, that it is the settled policy of the Government, not to interfere with the denominational peculiarities of the land. But in so far as it has been thought requisite or expedient to legislate at all upon the subject, the action of the Government has been unequivocally favorable to some of the general tenets by which evangelical christianity is characterized. In support of this assertion, we need only refer again to the constitutional provision made by several of the States, (including Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, North and South Carolina, and Pennsylvania) in reference to qualifications for office. The provision in the constitution of the last named State is so pointedly explicit, as to have occasioned great offence

to those holding the view which is therein virtually condemned. It is found in Art. IX Sect. 4—" *That no person who acknowledges the being of a God, and a future state of rewards and punishments, shall, on account of his religious sentiments be disqualified to hold any office, or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.*" And it is assuredly significant that *this article was retained, unamended, in the revised constitution of 1838.* This did not happen through accidental oversight. The provision was felt to be sorely obnoxious to some classes of citizens. Numerous petitions were poured in upon the convention, praying for its abrogation. These petitions were warmly advocated by two or three of the ablest members of the body. Earnest attempts were made to defeat it by amendments. One proposed, in lieu of the original article, to substitute: "That no person who acknowledges the being of a God, and his own accountability to the Supreme Being, shall on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified, &c." Another, assuming still more neutral ground, proposed that, "The civil and political rights, privileges or capacities, of any citizen, shall in no wise be diminished or enlarged, on account of his religion." Long and eloquent addresses were delivered, by the friends of these amendments, in defence of religious toleration, and political rights. But all was of no avail. This last quoted amendment was rejected by a vote of 88 against 16, the other by a vote of 86 against 26, and the original article was finally adopted, without alteration. This therefore is the present law of the State, and indicates the disposition of our constitution and laws upon this particular point. It may merely be added that this general principle so far prevails in ordinary practice as to exclude from our courts of Justice the testimony of all persons who hold views conflicting with it.

Having already examined the bearings of the statute against blasphemy, it will not be necessary to cite it here again. If however these two peculiarities simply, of our constitution and laws be candidly considered, they will be found abundantly to sustain our position. For it must be clear that provisions like these could only be designed to secure the State, against the moral influence of infidelity, or skeptical christianity, in the particular forms thus virtually condemned. It is sheer sophistry to plead, that such enactments are as favorable to Judaism, or Mohammedanism, as to Christianity,—when all the circumstances of the case, duly weighed, will prove that they were expressly designed for the protection of this last.

If therefore the Constitutional provisions, and Legislative en-

actments, rigidly enforced by the judicial decisions of a Government, must be admitted as valid evidence of its general religious character, or as proofs of the particular system of religious doctrines which it may favor, then it must be conceded, that the religion of the United States, is *Christian, Protestant, and Evangelical*.

Although this article has already exceeded the limits within which it was intended to confine it, we must beg indulgence for a few concluding reflections.

It seems then after all, that the founders of our Government, and the framers of our Constitutions and Laws, did not shrink from the responsibility of committing the nation in favor of the great and fundamental doctrines of Christianity. They did not consider it an infraction upon civil liberty, or the rights of conscience, to have such sentiments adopted and avowed, by the State, as might give mankind unequivocally to understand the position maintained by the American Republic in reference to religion. There is indeed no formal creed—no stately establishment. Every thing is done, on the contrary, to prevent a union of Church and State. And we may well be glad of it. But whilst this extreme is avoided, the other of utterly discountenancing religion is equally shunned. It was well understood by those wise, and brave, and good men, that as there was a political medium between tyranny and anarchy, so there was also a religious medium, for the State, between a pampered establishment and national infidelity. In both cases they sought and found the desired medium. And their ready adoption of it teaches us that, if their political creed be sound, Governments have no right to act in such cases as if they were dead impersonal abstractions. That on the contrary they are invested with all the faculties and powers that render the individuals composing them responsible agents. They are subject to the same natural and moral laws, and can under no circumstances escape from their accountability to the King of kings. However loudly therefore those who deny all religion may complain, that the Government should obtrude religious doctrines upon their civil relations to it, the evil, if an evil, cannot be remedied, unless by some means the moral obligations of the State can be dissolved, without at the same time involving an utter dissolution of every moral and social bond by which civil society is held together.

But we insist upon what has been already proven, that no wrong is done by the position thus assumed, to a single upright citizen, which could possibly be redressed, without inflicting greater wrong upon ten thousand others. They who would

have our constitution and laws stripped of every feature by which they are allied to christianity, can surely not reflect upon the import of their demands. If they did, it seems to us that the injustice and absurdity of them would become so manifest, that they would be instantly abandoned. For to name no other consideration, the fact that their demand, if granted, would disfranchise fourteen millions of our citizens, for the sake of accommodating the provisions of the Government to the irreligious fancies of a few thousand, would be sufficient to condemn it.

Such then being the actual position of our Government upon this subject, we see no reason why it should not be freely proclaimed. Rather is it, due to the nation, to mankind, and to religion, to give full and clear utterance to the fact. It is due to religion that this should be done; for if our country owes its greatness mainly to Christianity, then it is just that He should have the praise, to whose Divine goodness we are indebted for the blessings of the Gospel. It is due to the nation that this should be done; for if a nation is responsible for its moral influence, it has a right assuredly to ask, that its provisions and enactments in favor of truth, morality, and righteousness, be publicly proclaimed without reserve. And again this is due to mankind; for as the mutual moral and social dependencies of individuals extend to nations, each separate nation owes the full weight of its moral influence in favor of social virtue and happiness, to all the rest.

Instead therefore of tamely and tacitly yielding the assumptions of unbelievers and ultra-liberalists upon this point, why should not all who are concerned for the true honor and welfare of our country, rather be zealous in securing for her, as well as for humanity and truth, the full advantage of this her true position in reference to christianity? Why should the whole weight of our national influence be allowed to go, without contradiction, against the world's highest and truest life? Why should our own children be compelled to contend, in their moral development, against the force of this additional impediment? Why should strangers of other climes and of utterly different religions, be enticed to make our land their home, under the false impression that they can here enjoy a degree of freedom from all moral or religious limitations, which no civil Government could grant, without thereby laying a ruinous train for its own ultimate explosion? It is indeed the glory of our Republic, to be the asylum for the oppressed of all nations, to which the wronged may flee for refuge from the relentless persecutions of civil and religious tyranny. But because it is thus

an *asylum* for the suffering, no one has a right to convert it into a *sewer* for the abandoned and depraved.

Easton, Pa.

J. H. A. B.

THE APOSTLE PETER.

[An extract from Schaff's Church History.]

His Character.

SIMON, according to his old name, or according to his new one PETER, was the son of the fisherman Jonas, (Matth. iv: 18, xvi: 17, John i: 43, xxi: 16), born in Bethsaida of Galilee (John i: 45), and settled at Capernaum (Matth. viii: 14, Luke iv: 38), where he pursued himself his father's business. His brother Andrew, a disciple of John the Baptist, first brought him to Jesus, by whom he was called to become a fisher of men (Matth. iv: 18 ff. Mark i: 16 ff. John i: 41 f.). From the time of that miraculous draught of fishes, which served to overwhelm him at once with the sense of his majesty and power and with the feeling of his own weakness and sinfulness (Luke v: 3 ff.), he gave himself up entirely to his service, and with John and the elder James stood ever after in the nearest intimacy with his person, being along with them a witness of the transfiguration on Tabor and of the awful conflict of Gethsemane. Among these three moreover he appears evidently the most prominent. He is the proper "organ of the entire apostolic college,"¹ he speaks and acts in their name. While the contemplative self-communing John lay in mysterious silence on Jesus' breast, the more practical and active Peter was never able to conceal his inmost nature; it comes everywhere involuntarily to light, so that we are thus better acquainted both with his virtues and faults from the evangelical narrative, than we are with those of any other apostle. With the most ardent devotion he gives himself up to the Saviour, and confesses in the name of his fellow dis-

¹ So Chrysostom styles him, in Joann. homil. 88, where he says of him: *ἡσυχῆς ὡς τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ στήμα τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ κορυφὴ τοῦ χοροῦ.*

ciples that he is the Messiah, the Son of the living God (Matth. xvi : 16). Soon after he undertakes, with unbecoming familiarity and unconscious presumption, to administer to him a rebuke, and to dissuade him from the course of suffering which was required for the redemption of the world (Matth. xvi : 22). On the mount of transfiguration he is bent prematurely on building tabernacles, to perpetuate the happiness he felt in a simply outward way (Matth. xvii : 4). At the feet-washing, his high-minded modesty leads him to make himself wiser than his Master: "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?—Thou shalt never wash my feet!" (John xiii : 6, 8). What a remarkable mixture of glowing love to Christ and rash self-reliance proclaims itself in his vow, shortly before the scene in the garden: "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended!—Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee" (Matth. xxvi : 23, 25). What a stormy inconsiderate and carnal zeal he displays in Gethsemane itself, where he grasps the sword instead of preparing himself meekly to suffer (John xviii : 10)! Soon after followed his deep deplorable fall, when through fear of men and love of life he became untrue to his Master. In the hand of God, however, this was to serve the purpose of bringing him by bitter experience to the knowledge of his own weakness, to heartfelt humiliation, and to the settlement of his strength in a better form on God's grace alone. The Lord did not forsake him; he prayed that his faith should not fail (Luke xxiii : 32), restored him again after his resurrection to the pastoral office of which he had rendered himself unworthy by his fall, and gave him the charge of his sheep and lambs. He had to meet indeed a severe trial first in the thrice repeated inquiry: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me—lovest thou me more than these?" by which, to fill him with contrition and shame, the Saviour reminded him of his threefold denial and of the way in which he had exalted himself before above his fellow disciples. We find his pride now bowed down, his ardor purified; he ventured no more to place himself above the rest, but submitted the measure of his love to the Searcher of hearts, being well assured that he loved him and recognizing in this love the very element of his life, but at the same time painfully sensible that he did not love him as he ought and as he gladly would (John xxi : 15 ff.). That he allowed himself even after this to be hurried by the impulse of the moment into inconsistent conduct, is shown by the occasion which drew on him Paul's rebuke at Antioch (Gal. ii : 11, 14). This whole occasion also however he had grace to improve to his own humilia-

tion, keeping in view continually the last prophetic word of his Master, that he must walk in the way of self-denial and complete his obedience and faithfulness finally by suffering without any will of his own (John xxi: 19). For otherwise we find, that before the people and the chief council, and in view of the greatest danger, he confessed his faith without fear, and maintained his love towards the Lord with fidelity through all toil and hardship even to martyrdom itself in the most excruciating form, amply justifying thus the honor bestowed upon him by his new name (Acts iii: 1-26 iv: 1-22, v: 17-41, xii: 3-17).

These traits from the life of Simon Peter give us a picture, in which great natural gifts and excellencies are strikingly combined with peculiar defects. He is distinguished from the other eleven disciples by a fiery, excitable, choleric-sanguine temperament, by an open, clearly intellectual, practical nature, bold self-reliance, prompt readiness for action, and a considerable talent for representation and church government. He is prepared at all times to speak out his mind and heart, to come to purpose and deed. This natural constitution itself, however, exposed him strongly to the temptation of vanity, self-confidence and ambition. His excitable, impulsive nature ran very easily into a false estimate of his own powers, by which he was in danger of being thrown off his guard, and so of being carried just as easily away for the moment, in seasons of temptation, by impressions of a quite opposite sort. This explains his denial of the Lord, notwithstanding the joyful firmness that characterised the profession of his faith at other times. In *depth* of knowledge and love he falls short doubtless of a Paul and a John, and he was not so well fitted as they were accordingly for the business of completion. His strength lay in the fire of immediate inspiration, in promptness of speech and action, and in an imposing authoritative manner which at once commanded respect and obedience. He was a born church prince, and his gifts were admirably suited, after proper purification by the Spirit of Christ, for the business of beginning, for the first formation and ordering of the christian community.

The Position of Peter in Church History.

What has now been said indicates the place and significance of this apostle in the history of the Church, as determined by his natural qualifications, sanctified by the Holy Ghost and made to stand in the service of the truth. The Lord knew what was

in him from the first, and at his first calling even, with reference to his subsequent activity, bestowed upon him the name *Cephas*, in the later Hebrew dialect, or *Peter*, as translated into Greek, signifying Rock (John i: 43, Mark iii: 16). This name of honor he confirmed to him a year later, and connected with it the remarkable promise which has become an occasion of strife in church history. Whilst other people took Jesus at best for a forerunner of the Messiah, and so for a mere man only however highly distinguished, Simon apprehended and confessed first with the full energy of living faith the great central mystery, the fundamental article of Christianity, namely the Messiahship of his Master, the absolute union of the divine and human and the fulness of all life in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; in an hour of crisis and sifting, in which many became apostate, he proclaimed, in the name of all his fellow disciples, from the inmost sanctuary of experience and with the emphasis of the most sure and firm conviction, this good confession: "Thou art the Christ"—the Anointed of God, the long promised and earnestly expected Messiah—"the Son of the living God!" (Matth. xvi: 16, comp. Mark viii: 29, Luke ix: 20); or according to the somewhat fuller text of John: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God!" (John vi: 66-69). On the ground of this primitive christian creed, this triumphant saving confession of faith, which flesh and blood had not revealed to him, that is, neither his own nature nor any other man, as formerly his brother Andrew (John i: 42, 43), but the Father in heaven, the Lord pronounced him blessed and said: "*Thou art Peter. (Rock, a man of rock,) and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*" (Matth. xvi: 18). The rich word-play of the Greek original, *ὃς ὁ λίθος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ λίθῃ*, can be fully rendered again only in French: "tu es *Pierre*, et sur cette *pierre*."

¹ Our Lord of course employed the Aramæan *ܐܬܝܢ*, which was translated by *λίθος* instead of the more usual *πέτρα*, and for the reason doubtless that the name of a man was to be expressed, and that the masculine form was otherwise in use for such purpose (Leont. Schol. 18, Fabric. biblioth. gr. xi, 334). With the classics *λίθος* signifies properly a stone, *πέτρα* a large rock. This distinction however is not steadily observed, and in the passage before us it is quite disregarded, since the Greek word must correspond with the Hebrew original which always means rock. In figurative speech *λίθος* is employed by the classics also to denote firmness and stability, for instance by Homer, *Odyss.* xvii, 463, but more frequently for hardness of heart and want of feeling.

In the interpretation of this passage, two false views are to be avoided. On the one side the promise may not be disjoined from the confession, and attached simply to the *person* of Simon as such.¹ For, in the first place, the name "Peter" v : 18, stands opposed to the original name "Simon Bar-jona" v : 17, and denotes thus the new spiritual man, into which the old Simon was partly transformed already and partly still to be transformed more and more, by the Spirit of Christ. And then again, the Lord himself directly after says to the same apostle, (Matth. xvi : 23), indulging his natural spirit : "Get thee behind me, *Satan* (evil counsellor, adversary,) thou art an offence unto me ; for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." He had undertaken, namely in truth with the most well meaning and good natured intention, but still with shortsighted carnality and presumption, to dissuade his Master from the way of the cross, which was indispensably required for the salvation of the world.—Just as unreasonable is it, on the other side, when many Protestant theologians sunder the "*petra*" from the previous "*Peter*," and make it to refer wholly to the *confession* in v : 16. For this plainly destroys the beautiful and significant play of the words, as well as the sense of *ταύτην* which necessarily refers to the "Peter" going just before. And besides, the Church of Christ is not built upon abstract doctrine and confession, but upon living persons as the bearers of truth.

Rather the words "Thou art a Rock, &c.," are by all means to be referred indeed to Peter, but only to him as he comes before us in the immediate connexion of the text, that is to the renovated Peter, so far as the mystery of the Incarnation has come to be revealed to him by God (v : 16 and 17), to Peter the courageous confessor of the Saviour's Divinity, in one word to *Peter in Christ* ; and the sense is accordingly : "I appoint thee as the living witness of this fundamental truth which thou hast now acknowledged, to the first and leading agency in the founding of my Church." Our Lord describes thus the *official character* of this apostle, and prophesies to him his *future place in church history*. The believing and boldly witnessing Peter appears here as the foundation stone, Christ himself as the builder of that glorious spiritual structure, which no hostile power can destroy. In the absolute sense Christ is indeed called the foundation (*θεμελιος*) of the Church, besides which no other can be

¹ Then we should have in Greek rather: *ἐπὶ σὲ τὸν πέτρον*.

laid (1 Cor. iii : 11); but in a secondary or relative sense so are the Apostles also, whom he employed as his instruments. Hence it is said of the saints Eph. ii : 20, that they are built "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (*ἐπὶ τ. θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων κ. πρ.*), Jesus Christ being himself the chief corner-stone; and hence also the twelve foundations (*θεμελίαι*) of the new Jerusalem bear the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (Rev. xxi : 14). If now the Apostles in general are the human founders of the Church, under the guidance of course of the Holy Ghost, as Christ's ministers and "laborers together with God" (1 Cor. iii : 9), the true Builder—this holds of Peter, as their representative and leader, in a sense altogether peculiar.

This view is supported accordingly also by the Acts of the Apostles, the first twelve chapters of which form a continuous commentary on the prophetic word of Christ Matth. xvi : 18. If even before the Resurrection Peter stands at the head of the apostolic college,¹ he is still more plainly after it, till Paul comes on the stage, the leading spirit, the acting and speaking organ of the entire christian body. He plays the principal part at the election of Matthias to fill the place of Judas, on the day of Pentecost, at the healing of the lame man, and in the punishment of Ananias; he it was, who more than any one else extended the Church by word and deed in Judea and Samaria, boldly defended the christian cause before the sanhedrim, and refused to be deterred from doing so even by chains and bonds; and as he stood at the head of the Jewish mission, so also did he lay the foundation of the mission among the Gentiles by the baptism of Cornelius without previous circumcision. In short, on to the apostolic council at Jerusalem, a. 50 (Acts xv), Peter is without question the most important personage in the church, and asserts a primacy, which so clearly belongs to him by his natural qualifications as well as by the prophetic word of his Master, and is so fully confirmed by manifold facts in the sacred narrative, that only the most blind party spirit can explain, without in the least justifying however, the headstrong humor which affects to deny it." But we meet with no trace ever of hierar-

¹ As appears from every list given of the Apostles, as well as from many other passages: Matth. x, 2 ff. xiv, 28, xvi, 16-19, xvii, 4, 25, 26, xviii, 21 xix, 27, Mark iii, 16 ff., viii, 29, ix, 2, xiv, 23, Luke vi, 14, ff., xii, 41, xxii, 31 ff., John vi, 68, xxi, 15 ff., &c.

² Of course nothing follows still from this concession for the known pretensions of the Papacy, since these rest not simply by any means on the fact here noticed, but on two other suppositions also which are not to be

chical pretension on this ground in the later history of Peter, who describes himself rather quite modestly as a "co-presbyter and witness of the sufferings of Christ, and exhorts the elders to feed the flock of Christ, not in the spirit of covetousness and ambition, but with the pattern of a godly life (1 Peter v: 1-3). Then again, the supremacy never came into collision with the independence of the other apostles, in their proper spheres of labor, and did not pretend to keep pace with the universal spread of the church, or at least did not stretch itself with like authority over every part. From the council of Jerusalem on, Peter appears no longer, but James, at the head of the congregation in that city and of the strict Jewish-Christian party. On the field of the mission to the Gentiles, and of the first literature of christianity, he was completely overshadowed by the later called Paul (comp. 1 Cor. xv, 10); who sustains to him, according to the representation of the same book of Acts that places Peter so high in the beginning, a similar relation, so to speak, with that of the rising sun to the setting moon. At all events his position with regard to him was one of the most perfect independence, as is shown abundantly by the first two chapters even of the Epistle to the Galatians. The last stadium in the pro-

proved directly from the New Testament. The first is, that the primacy of Peter allowed *transmission*. This however is not merely without a syllable of mention, but is at once also rendered improbable by the fact that all other surnames given to the apostles express purely *personal* gifts and *personal* relations—as the epithet "Sons of Thunder" given to James and John (Mark iii, 17), the "Zealot" to the other Simon (Luke vi, 15, Acts i, 13), and the "Traitor" to Judas Iscariot (Luke vi, 16). That the same held good of the peculiar position of Peter, was a widely prevalent view in the ancient Church. So Firmilianus, bishop of Neo-cæsarea in Cappadocia, a cotemporary of Cyprian, among other things reproaches the Roman bishop Stephen in the name of the Asiatic bishops with wishing to bring in, instead of the *one* rock on which Christ had built his Church, *many* rocks, by extending the prerogative of Peter to all his successors (Cyp. Epist. 75. "Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani sultitiam, quod, qui sic de episcopatus sui jure gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesie collocata sunt, *multas alias petras* inducat). The second supposition of the Papacy which cannot be proved, is that Peter *actually did transmit* his primacy, and this not say to the bishop of Antioch, or of Jerusalem where at least he spent many years, but to the bishop of Rome, where at best he could have held the episcopal office only for a very short time, and this not in the *later* church sense. Finally however, if it even stood better with both these arguments, there would be a huge difference still, between the purely spiritual superiority of Peter, with his exercise of it, and the ecclesiastico-secular primacy of the Pope in the form in which this is now asserted.

gress of the Apostolical Church, finally, after the death of Peter and Paul, it devolved on John properly alone to lead and with his genius to complete. But who besides can even for a moment bear the thought, which flows necessarily from the Roman view of the *enduring* force of the Petrine primacy, that the beloved disciple, who leaned on the breast of the God-man, was subject to the bishop of Rome, a Linus or a Clemens, as the successor and heir of Peter's authority, or that this last exercised a papal supremacy over the first? The special position which was assigned to Peter had regard thus manifestly to the work of *laying the foundation* of the Apostolical Church, and there is room to speak of it as of perpetual and universal force by succession, only so far as the gifts of all the *other* apostles perpetuate themselves in the christian world, and as they may be said, by their past deeds as well as by the unbroken action of their word and spirit, to condition the progressive character of the church in every stage of its history.

Peter in Rome.

It is the unanimous testimony of tradition that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero. This testimony was indeed in a short time obscured by all sorts of unhistorical and in part directly contradictory embellishments, and has been abused by the Roman hierarchy in support of boundless pretensions, on which account the truth of it, has been at times called in question, out of polemical zeal against the papacy¹ and partly from historical skepticism;² but by the great body of Protestant historians we find it always acknowledged as in its main substance at least entitled to credit.³ We will notice first the main voices

¹ Particularly by the Hollander *Frederick Spanheim*, who in his celebrated "*Dissertatio de ficta protectione Petri Apostoli in urbem Romam, deque non una traditionis origine*," first brought the matter from the year 1679 to a thorough inquiry, and endeavored by critical trial of the evidence to establish the doubts in regard to Peter's sojourn at Rome, which had been before thrown out by the Waldenses and certain declated enemies of the Papacy, such as Marsilius of Padua, Michael of Cæsena, Matthias Flacius and Claudius Salmasius. He derived the story mainly from the ambition of the Roman Church.

² Namely by the modern hypercritics, *Baur*, in several articles of the *Tübingen Zeitschrift* and in his work on Paul p. 212 ff. and *Schwegler*, *Nachap. Zeitalter*, I, p. 301 ff. They derive the story from the jealousy of the Roman Jewish Christians towards the Pauline Gentile Christians, an effort to set the Jewish apostle Peter above Paul. So *de Wette*, *Einl. in's N. T.* p. 314.

³ Namely by all the older Reformed theologians who have devoted specia

of the tradition on the subject, then try to determine the probable length of Peter's residence at Rome, and finally examine the statements made concerning the manner of his death.

The testimonies in regard to Peter's settlement in Rome.

The oldest is that of Peter himself in the date of his abode subscribed to his first Epistle, taken according to its oldest interpretation, c. v : 13 : "The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son (the Evangelist)." True, the sense of *Babylon* here is controverted. *Neander*, *Steiger*, *de Wette*, *Wieseler* and others, understand by it the celebrated Babylon or Babel on the Euphrates. The prophecy of the Hebrew prophet against this great city (Is. xiii : 19ff., xiv : 4, 12, xlv : 1f.) had been indeed terribly fulfilled, and it presented to view in the time of the Apostles, as *Strabo*, *Pausanias* and *Pliny* with one voice assure us, only a scene of ruins (ὁδὸν ἐμὴν τεῖχος), a desolation (solitudo). Still it may be assumed surely, that some portion of it yet remained habitable, and as we know that there were many thousand Jews in the satrapy of Babylon,^a the case in and of itself allows the supposition that Peter may have chosen just this region as the seat of his labors. But if so, we might reasonably expect that some trace would have been preserved of his activity there afterwards. Tradition however knows nothing of a sojourn of Peter in the kingdom of Parthia, while yet it follows there the steps of the apostle Thomas.^b Then again, it is scarcely possible to explain, on this interpretation, the acquaintance

study and inquiry to the field of ecclesiastical antiquities, then by *Schröckh*, *Mynster*, *Giessler*, *Neander*; (who however in the latest edition of his work on the Acts, staggered apparently somewhat by the argument of Baur, speaks no longer so decidedly in favor of the tradition as before,) by *Credner*, *Bleek*, *Olshausen* and *Wieseler* (in the second excursus of his chronology), not to mention a number of others who have not entered into any close investigation of the subject.

^a See the passages in *Meyerhoff's* Einl. in die petrin. Schriften (1835) p. 129.

^b *Josephus* Antiq. xv, 3, 1, *Philo* de legat. ad Caj. p. 587. True, *Josephus* also informs us xviii, 9, 8, that under the emperor Caligula many Jews from fear of persecution removed from Babylon to Seleucia, and that the rest were driven away five years after by a pestilence. They might however very well have returned again before the date of Peter's Epistle, as Caligula was already dead a. 41.

^c Origen in Eusebius Hist. Eccl. III, 1.

which our Epistle is acknowledged to show with the later Epistles of Paul, since between Babylon and the Roman empire there was but little communication. Equally hard to understand would be Peter's association with Mark (v : 13), since this last in the years 61-63 was in Rome (Col. iv : 10, Philem. 23), and shortly after is supposed to be in Asia Minor, from whence he is again called to Rome by Paul a short time before his martyrdom (2 Tim. iv : 11). If he followed this invitation, as we have a right to suppose, he could not so readily find his way again to the banks of the Euphrates. The case however becomes quite simple, if Peter himself about that time or soon after came to Rome and there wrote his epistle.—These difficulties constrain us to return to the earliest and in ancient times only prevalent interpretation of Babylon, by which it is taken to mean *Rome*. This is known to be its sense in the Apocalypse, as even Roman Catholic expositors allow, c. xiv : 8, xvi : 19, xvii : 5, xviii : 2, 10, 21, comp. the allusion xvii : 9 to the seven hills, and xvii : 18, to the universal dominion of Rome.¹ It has been objected indeed, that this symbolical designation of the metropolis of paganism suits well enough for a prophetical poetical book, such as the Apocalypse, but not for the prose style of a common letter. But this objection is completely borne down by the following considerations in favor of the figurative sense : namely, 1. The unanimous testimony of the ancient church ;² 2. The analogy of the other titles in the form of salutation, which require to be taken also figuratively. Neander will have it indeed, that “*συνηλίκη*” is to be understood of Peter's wife, and that “*Marcus my son*” stands for his son literally according to the flesh.³ But although the apostle according to 1 Cor. ix : 5, did take his wife along with him in his missionary journeys, the mention of her in an official circular, and particularly to churches with which according to Neander's view he had no personal acquaintance, would still be certainly out of place and without all analogy in christian antiquity ; and we

¹ In the same way in a fragment of the Sibylline Books, supposed to belong to the first century, (v : 143, 159) Rome is called Babylon.

² So already *I'apias* or *Clemens Alex.* in Euseb. 11, 15, the subscription of the Epistle, *Jerome catal. s. Petr., Oecumenius, &c.* The allusion to Rome is held also, though not with all on the same grounds, by *Grotius, Lardner, Cave, Semler, Hützig, Baur, Schwogler, Thiersch.*

³ *Apostelgesch.* II, 8, 590, Anm. 4. So also *Mill, Bengel, Meyerhoff.* On the other hand *Steiger, de Wette, and Wieseler*, though they take Babylon literally, refer *συνηλίκη* still to the church in that place and “*Marcus*” to the Evangelist.

see not besides, how *συνεκλεκτή* should just of itself express the notion of a wife, nor why in that case the clause *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* is added just in this grammatical connection. All these difficulties disappear, if we supply *ἐκκλησία* and understand by it the christian congregation, as is done already by the Peschito and the Vulgate. So far as Mark is concerned, tradition knows nothing of a son of Peter according to the flesh by any such name.¹ It is altogether natural, on the other hand, to understand here the well known missionary assistant of Paul and Peter, the Evangelist of this name, who sprang from Jerusalem and had been probably converted by Peter (Acts xii: 12ff.), but at the same time formed also a bond of connection between him and the Apostle of the Gentiles, as did Silvanus likewise the bearer of the Epistle. If we are required thus, in harmony with the older expositors, to take *ᾠδὴ* tropically according to the familiar usage of the N. T. (comp. 1 Cor. iv: 16-18, Gal. iv: 19, 1 Thes. i: 2, 18, 2 Tim. i: 2, ii: 1), and to refer *συνεκλεκτή* to the congregation, it forms an argument in favor of the symbolical sense also of Babylon. Nay, we find just in this combination of the two terms a significant contrast, particularly under the oppressed condition in which the christians are regarded as standing. The Apostle speaks of the churches to whom he writes as "elect" (*ἐκλεκτοί* 1. 2.), and so now also of the church from whose midst he writes as "co-elect," chosen of God to everlasting life in the very seat of the deepest Pagan corruption, that must necessarily call up to a writer in particular like Peter, so thoroughly imbued with the prophetic style of the Old Testament, the description which is there given of the ancient Babylon. If we assume moreover that the epistle was written in the later years of Nero, when cruelty and tyranny were in full force, and shortly before the terrible scenes of Nero's persecution, at a time thus when the Christians, as the letter itself and the testimony of Tacitus show, had already become the object of foul suspicion and outrageous calumny,—it must be allowed that the symbolical designation of Rome, which Silvanus could easily explain to the readers in case they should not at once understand it, falls in very well with the entire contents and circumstances of the communication. The naming of Rome literally would have been clearly in this connection far less characteristic.

¹ *Clemens Alex.* speaks indeed in a general way of Peter's having children. Strom. III. f. 448: Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαυδοποιήσαντο, and tradition names a daughter, Petronilla, (comp. Acta Sanct. 30 May); but no Marcus is ever mentioned as his son.

To pass on now to the apostolical fathers, the Roman bishop *Clement*, a disciple of Paul, informs us indeed that Peter after having endured many sufferings died as a martyr, but gives neither the place nor the manner of his death; probably because it came not in his way, and was something which he could consider as generally known.¹ For wherever else the place of Peter's martyrdom is mentioned, it is always Rome, and no other church laid claim to this honor, although it was a great point with the churches then to possess distinguished martyrs.—Omitting the testimony of *Papias* in a somewhat obscure passage in Eusebius (II, 15), the Epistle of his cotemporary *Ignatius* to the Romans takes for granted that Peter had preached to them: as does also a fragment from the *Prædicatio Petri*, which belongs to the beginning of the second century.² Still more distinctly *Dionysius*, bishop of Corinth, (about a. 170), in his Epistle to the Romans, speaks of the *Roman* and Corinthian churches as the common planting of Peter and Paul, and adds: "For both taught alike in our Corinth when they planted us, and both also in Italy at the same place (*ὁμοσε*, which can be understood in its connection only of Rome), after teaching there suffered alike at the same time the death of martyrdom."³ That Peter is here styled one of the founders of the Corinthian church is indeed in any case very inaccurate, and possibly may be drawn simply from a misunderstanding of what Paul says 1 Cor. i: 12 of the party of Cephias, whose existence in this church implies some relation to it at least indirectly on his part. But we have no right on account of this error to reject the whole state-

¹ In his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which belongs still to the second half of the 1st cent., c. 5: Πέτρος διὰ ἡλόν ἀδίκον οὐχ ἔνα, ἀλλ' ἔσο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπέμεινεν (according to others ὑπῆνεγκεν) πάνας καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπερεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Then follows a more full and definite testimony in regard to the end of Paul. The word μαρτυρήσας is to be understood here probably in its original sense of witnessing by word, as in the passage immediately following, and not in the sense of martyrdom as it is usually taken. The last follows however out of the whole context, particularly the clause going just before which Clement then illustrates by examples: διὰ ἡλόν καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαίπατοι στέλτοι ἐδιώθησαν, καὶ ἰως θανάτου ἤλθον.

² c. 4: οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διάβασμαι ἐμὴν.

³ In *Cyp. Op.* ed. Rig. p. 139: liber qui inscribitur Pauli prædicatio (which was the last part probably of the *prædicatio Petri*, comp. Credner's *Beit. zur Einl.* I, 360), in quo libro invenies, post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem, postremo in urbe, quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos.

⁴ In Eusebius H. E. I, II, c. 25.

ment, and it is after all possible even that Peter, after Paul's confinement, on his way perhaps to Rome, may have visited Corinth, in which case he could not indeed literally found the church but still might strengthen it and confirm it in the faith. —*Irenæus*, who stands connected through Polycarp with the Apostle John, says of Peter and Paul, that they preached the gospel and founded the church at Rome.¹—Somewhat later, about the year 200, the Roman presbyter *Caius*, in his tract against the Montanist Proclus of Asia Minor, writes: "I can however show the monuments (*επιτάφια*) of the Apostles (Peter and Paul). For if you go to the Vatican or on the way to Ostia, you will find the monuments of the men who founded this church."—*Tertullian*² congratulates the Roman church, because there Peter had been made conformable to the sufferings of Christ, (that is crucified), Paul crowned with the end of the Baptist, (that is, beheaded), and John after being plunged in seething oil, without hurt, (a fabulous addition no doubt), banished to Patmos.

These are the oldest and most important testimonies, which are drawn from the most different parts of the church. They show it is true some want of accuracy, since Peter cannot be called strictly the founder of the church at Rome. Still more are the statements we meet with in the apocryphal writings, and in the later church fathers, as *Eusebius* and *Jerome*, nay in *Clemens Alexandrinus* already (in Euseb. II, 15), full of fabulous embellishments, particularly in regard to Peter's meeting with Simon Magus at Rome, which rests probably on false conclusions drawn from the narration Acts viii: 18ff., and on a mistake of Justin Martyr who supposed he had seen a statue of Simon Magus in that city. But such accumulations, gathered by the onward progress of an old tradition, by no means authorise us to discard also its primary substance. This is not to be explained in the case before us certainly from the rivalry of the Roman Jewish Christians towards the Pauline Gentile Christians; for it must then have been met by these last with early decided contradiction; whereas on the contrary just the oldest witnesses for it belong mainly to the school of Paul and John. Just as little did it spring from the hierarchical ambition of the

¹ Adv. haer. III, 1, comp. 3, where the Roman church is spoken of as "a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo, fundata et constituta ecclesia."

² In *Eusebius* H. E. II, 25.

³ De praesc. haer. c. 36.

Roman bishops, although this soon laid hold of it indeed and used it for its own ends. Because the tradition itself is demonstrably older than the abuse of it for hierarchical purposes, and had there been any sufficient ground for calling it in question, this would certainly have been done in the first centuries by the opponents of the Roman pretensions in the Greek and African Churches. But no such contradiction was raised in any quarter, either by the Catholics or on the part of heretics and schismatics. The gigantic structure of the Papacy could never have risen, without any historical foundation, out of a pure lie; rather just the fact of the presence and martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome, in connection with the political position of this world-metropolis, must be taken as the indispensable main condition of its growth and the authority it gained over Christendom for so many hundred years.

The duration of Peter's settlement at Rome.

The questions, *when* Peter came to Rome, *how long* he labored there, and in *what capacity*, are not determined by the older testimonies. When Dionysius of Corinth, Irenæus and Caius, ascribe to Peter and Paul the joint founding of the Roman church, it is not necessary to take it chronologically, in the sense that these Apostles had brought the first knowledge of the gospel. For in such sense Paul himself was not its founder, as little as Peter was the founder of the Corinthian church, which yet the same Dionysius affirms. In fact however this expression, which in and of itself might denote merely the important part which Peter took in establishing a church of long previous standing but still in an imperfect state,¹ came soon to be taken exclusively in the chronological sense, whereby there arose a confusion in the tradition, favored by the silence of the N. T. in regard to the later labors of Peter. Eusebius is the first, who in his *Chronicon* brings our Apostle to Rome under Claudius already a. 42, sets him over the church there for twenty years (according to the Armenian version of the original Greek text now lost), or five and twenty (as Jerome gives it), and places his martyrdom in the last year of Nero a. 67 or 68. Resting on Eusebius, Jerome also reports, that Peter was bishop first of

¹ So with full right we may speak of Calvin as the founder of the Reformed Church in Geneva, although the Reformation was introduced there several years before him by Farel.

Antioch (according to a later view for seven years), and then from the second year of Claudius, that is from a. 42 on, was bishop twenty five years of Rome ;¹ in which representation he is followed by the older Catholic historians.²

But this view contradicts the plainest facts of the New Testament, and cannot stand a moment before the bar of criticism. The Acts of the Apostles, which describe so fully the earlier labors of Peter, allow in no case the supposition of his absence from Palestine before his imprisonment by Agrippa, Acts xii : 3, 17; and as this falls in the year of the death in Palestine (comp. Acts xi : 28, xii : 1), that is a. 44 (not a. 42, according to the wrong calculation of Eusebius), it serves at all events to set aside the chronological term of seven years for the episcopate of Antioch, as well as to shorten by several years, the quarter of a century assigned to the Roman episcopate. After his deliverance from prison, that is in the fourth year of Claudius, the Apostle might indeed *possibly* have travelled to Rome ; as Luke remarks indefinitely, Acts xii : 17, that he departed to another place, and from this on to the Apostolic council a. 50 (c. xv.) leaves him out of sight.³ But this possibility becomes at once highly im-

¹ De script. eccles. c. 1, Simon Petrus—post episcopatum Antiochenis ecclesiae et praedicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcisione crediderant in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia, secundo Claudii imperatoris anno ad expugnandam Simonem magum Romam pergit ibique *viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit*, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est decimum quartum.

² Even the most zealous friends of the Papacy however are driven to a modification at least of the Eusebian tradition. *Baronius*, in his Annals (ad ann. 39. no. 25), makes Peter indeed to be 7 years bishop of Antioch and then 25 years bishop of Rome, but assumes at the same time that the Apostle was frequently absent from his see, when the N. T. facts for instance imperiously require it, and refers this to his papal dignity, or the care of the general Church devolved upon him by God. Sic videas—he says—Petrus his temporibus numquam fere eodem loco consistere, sed ut opus esse videret, peragraré provincias, invisere ecclesias, ac denique omnes quae sunt universalis praefecturae functiones pastoralis sollicitudine exequi ac consumere.

³ This period accordingly the most recent acute and learned defender of the Roman tradition, *Fr. Windischmann* in his "Vindiciae Petrinae" Ratisb. 1836 p. 112–116, fixes upon for the first journey of Peter to Rome. With him agrees somewhat too hastily in this the Protestant theologian *Thiersch*, when he says in his work on the N. T. Corn. p. 105f.; "It is certain that, before the banishment of the Jews from the city by Claudius, a christian church, mainly if not wholly of Jewish origin, had been formed there. And we see not what objection of any force can be urged against the tradition, that Peter was its founder. This may well have taken place between the year 44 and a. 50 or 51, that is between Peter's flight from Jerusalem

probable, or rather almost wholly inconceivable, when it is considered that the Epistle to the Romans written a. 58 contains no hint of any previous presence of Peter in Rome, but of itself rather implies the contrary; since Paul repeatedly declares it to have been his principle, not to build on foreign ground and not to encroach on the sphere of another Apostle's labors (Rom. xv: 20, 21, 2 Cor. x: 15, 16). We must assume thus, to uphold the tradition, a twofold Roman church, one founded by Peter under Claudius, which was afterwards dissolved by his edict against the Jews, and another wholly new one gathered after the year 52 through the influence mainly of Paul. But this resort also is overthrown, when we come to think how easily the whole story of Peter's journey to Rome under the Emperor Claudius can be explained from a reigning mistake and from false reasoning. Justin Martyr namely had reported,⁴ that Simon Magus betook himself *under Claudius* to Rome, and there gained many followers and even divine honors, as was shown by a statue erected to him on an island in the Tiber. This statue was in fact found a. 1574 in the place described, but turned out to be a statue, not of *Simo Sanctus*, but of the Sabine Roman divinity *Semo Sancus* or *Sangus* (comp. *Ovid's* fast. vi, 213), of whom the Oriental Justin probably had never heard.⁵ But the tradition now laid hold of this report, and sent Peter, in its zeal to glorify him as much as possible, on the heels of the supposed Samaritan arch-heretic, to vanquish him in Rome also as triumphantly as he had before done, according to Acts viii, in Samaria.⁶ To this was added the statement of Suetonius concerning the edict of Claudius, which expelled the Jews and probably also the Jewish Christians (on account of the "*impulsore Chresto*") from Rome, presupposing consequently the existence of a christian church in the place; and since Peter was regarded as the proper founder of it, the inference followed of

(Acts xii, 17) and the Apostolic council (c. xv), so that the banishment of the Jews from Rome precisely may have forced him also to leave that city, and led him to return to Jerusalem, where we find him when the council met."

⁴ Apol. maj. c. 26 and 56.

⁵ See *Hug's* Einl. II, 69ff. *Giesel's* K. G. I. 1 p. 64, and *Neander's* K. G. II. p. 783 (2nd ed.).

⁶ Of this conflict notice is taken already in the Pseudo-clementine writings, particularly the Recognitions, the composition of which is to be referred to the first quarter of the third century. That *Eusebius* was guided in his chronology by the narration of Justin, to which he himself appeals, is shown clearly by his *Eccl. Hist.* II, 13-15.

itself that he had already under this emperor betaken himself to Rome. The more readily the chronological determination of Eusebius and Jerome, in regard to so early a presence of the Apostle in this city, admits of being explained in this way from erroneous combinations, the less claim can it have to be regarded as worthy of credit.

Much less still however can it be shown, that Peter was in Rome continuously, or even for any considerable period, on from the time of Claudius. In the Acts of the Apostles and in Paul's Epistles we find on to the year 63 or 64, that is on to the salutation in his own first Epistle (v : 13), no trace of his presence in this city, but incontrovertible evidence enough of his absence from it. For in the year 50 he was in Jerusalem at the council of the Apostles (Acts xv.), and had to this time labored mainly, not among the Gentiles, of whom the greater part of the Roman church consisted according to Rom. i : 5, 7, 13, xi : 13, 25, 28, xiv : 1ff., xv : 15, 16, but among the Jews, which he proposed also to do in the time immediately following, according to his agreement then entered into with Paul and Barnabas (Gal. ii : 7, 9). Soon after this we find him at Antioch (Gal. ii : 11ff.). At the time of Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, that is a. 57, he had yet no fixed settlement, but travelled about as a missionary with his wife (1 Cor. ix : 5). In the year 58 he cannot have been in Rome, for then Paul would certainly have named him among the many salutations which he then forwarded there in Rom. xvi. Altogether the Epistle to the Romans knows nothing of the labors of Peter, either then or before, in that great metropolis, but as already remarked supposes rather the contrary. In the spring of a. 61 Paul came himself as a prisoner to Rome; the Acts informs us of his meeting with christians of that place, (xxviii : 15ff.), but say not a syllable of Peter, which on the supposition of his being there would be utterly inexplicable. In the years 61-63 Paul wrote from Rome his last Epistles, in which he introduces by name his companions and helpers, presents salutations from them, and complains finally of his being left alone (Col. iv : 10, 11, Philem. 23, 24, Phil. iv : 21, 22, 2 Tim. iv : 9-22, i : 15-18), but passes over Peter in profound silence, and this surely not out of jealousy or dislike, but because he was not in his neighborhood.

Peter can have come to Rome first therefore only after the second Epistle to Timothy, and not long before the date of his own Epistles, that is in the last half of the year 63 or in the

beginning of the year 64;’ and so accordingly, as he suffered martyrdom in the persecution under Nero, we can hardly extend his sojourn there above one year.⁶ Eusebius and Jerome indeed place his death in the year 67; but since they affirm at the same time, along with universal tradition, that he died at the same time with Paul in the persecution under Nero, which according to Tacitus broke out in July a. 64; and since a second persecution under the same emperor cannot be proved, the chronological date thus given is clearly erroneous; and is owing to the fact in part no doubt, that the fathers in this point, instead of following the accurate and full statement of *Tacitus*, made use rather of *Suetonius*, who separates the persecution from its occasion, the burning of the city, and altogether is not chronological in his narration.⁷

That Peter, as long as he was in Rome, stood in conjunction with Paul at the head of the affairs of the church and exercised a leading influence, needs no proof; but that he was *bishop* in the proper sense, and so the *first* bishop of Rome, contradicts the nature of the Apostolic office, which has regard to the church as a whole and not to any single diocese, and is a fiction of the Ebionitic Clementine Homilies, from which, as wrought afterwards into more orthodox form in the Recognitions, it passed over into the Catholic Church. *Clement* himself the third Roman bishop, knew nothing of it, and from the glowing description he gives of Paul in the 5th chapter of his first epistle

⁶ This is confirmed in substance also by *Lactantius* († 339), who brings Peter to Rome first under the reign of Nero (*De mortibus persec. c. 2, Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit etc.*), and by *Origen* († 254), who brings him there at the close of his life (*ἐπὶ τῆς αἰ.*, in Euseb. H. E. III, 1.).

⁷ As even an unprejudiced Roman Catholic writer grants in an article of the *Theol. Quarterly* published by Drey, Herbst and Hirscher, Tübingen 1820 p. 567f. *Windischmann* will have it indeed, that Peter resided in Rome during the intervals also of which we have no direct notice in the N. T. as regards the question here in hand, namely in the years 44–49, 52–58, 60–61 and 64–68. But if so, he must have been there in very furtive style, must have kept purposely out of the way of the Epistle to the Romans and of Paul’s arrival in the city, and according to Paul’s Epistles left no trace of his presence there before the year 63! In zeal for the honor of the Prince of the Apostles must we cry out to such an advocate; *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!*

⁸ Comp. on this defect in the Eusebian chronology *Wieseler* p. 544ff. The influence of *Suetonius* appears most plainly in *Orosius*, *Histor. VIII, 7*. Only *Sulpitius Severus* *Hist. sac. II, 29*, seems to have used the statement of *Tacitus*. Possibly the condemnatory judgment which the stoical historian pronounces on the christians (*Annal. XV, 44*), was the ground of his being slighted by the church fathers.

to the Corinthians, we can see clearly that he ascribes a greater significance to this Apostle for the Roman church than he does to Peter. *Irenaeus* and *Eusebius* name *Linus* rather as the first Roman bishop, and even *Epiphanius* himself makes a distinction plainly between the apostolical and episcopal offices.¹⁰

The martyrdom of Peter.

It is the universal voice of antiquity, that Peter was crucified in the persecution under Nero. Consequently, as already remarked, his death cannot fall in the year 67, as even most later historians give it, following Eusebius and Jerome, but must be placed in the year 64, in which this persecution broke out directly after the firing of the city in July, and in which also an end was put to the earthly labors of Paul, only perhaps somewhat earlier and by the less degrading process of decapitation. As the place of his punishment, according to the testimony of Caius already quoted, was pointed out at the end of the second century the Vatican hill beyond the Tiber, where lay the Circus and Nero's Gardens, and where according to Tacitus the persecution of the christians actually took place. There also was built to his memory the church of Peter, as over Paul's grave on the way to Ostia without the city the church of Paul.

The oldest testimony for the crucifixion of Peter we find already in the appendix to John's Gospel c. xxi : 18, 19, where our Lord himself, in the memorable dialogue there recorded, foretells to him that in his old age he would stretch forth his hands, and that another should bind him and lead whither naturally he would not wish. *Tertullian* remarks expressly, that Peter in his passion was made like the Lord." The statement, that he suffered crucifixion with his head downwards toward the earth, meets us first in Origen,¹¹ and this was taken afterwards

¹⁰ See *Schliermann's* Clementinen (1844) p. 115, and Gieseler's K. G. I. 1, p. 103. 281.

¹¹ De praeser. haeret. c. 36. - - Romam - - ubi Petrus passioni Dominicae adaequatur.

¹² In Euseb. H. E. III, 1 : Πέτρος - - ὅς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνακολούθησεν κατὰ κεφαλῆς, ὅπως αὐτός ἀλώσας παθεῖν. This is then thus paraphrased in the spirit of monkish piety by *Rufinus* : crucifixus est deorsum capite demerso, quod ipse ita fieri deprecatus est, ne exaequari Domino videretur. In like style *Jerome*, who had a spécial relish for such traits, De vir. illustr. c. 1 : a quo (Nero) et affixus cruci, martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso et in sublimē pedibus elevatis ; asserens se indignum, qui sic crucifigiretur ut Dominus suus.

as an evidence of his special humility, by which he felt himself unworthy to die in the same manner with Christ. When we read in Tacitus of the unnatural tortures to which the christians were subjected by Nero, the fact of such a mode of death seems not improbable, although the motive brought in to explain it betrays a later sickly conception of the nature of humility, whereas the Apostles counted it their greatest honor and joy rather to be like their Lord and Master in all particulars. It is related by Ambrose, that Peter shortly before his death, being overpowered by his former love of life, made his escape from prison, but was arrested and confounded in his flight by the appearance of the Saviour bearing his cross, who in reply to the question, "Lord, whither goest thou?" solemnly responded: "I am going to Rome, to be crucified again!" Whereupon Peter hastily turned back and met death with joy. This tradition still lives in the mouth of the people of Rome, and is embodied in a church styled *Domine quo vadis*, in front of the Sebastian gate, on the Appian way. It is one of those significant stories, that rest on no historical fact indeed but still on a right apprehension of the character in question, and to which may be applied the Italian proverb: *se non è vero, è ben trovato*. To shrink from suffering was in truth a characteristic trait of the natural Simon (comp. xvi: 22, 23, the account of his denial of Christ and what Christ says to him John xxi: 18). But at so great an age he had no doubt long surmounted this feeling, and welcomed the hour, when he was counted worthy to seal his love to the Saviour with his blood and permitted to put off his earthly tabernacle (2 Peter i: 14), for the purpose of entering on "the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away" (1 Peter i: 4), which he knew to be reserved for him in heaven.

Translated by J. W. N.

THE ANGLICAN CRISIS.

THE man who takes no lively interest in the present ecclesiastical troubles of England, under the notion possibly that they belong only to a standpoint of prejudice and superstition which he and the American world generally have happily left forever behind, has good reason to suspect some fatal flaw in the constitution of his own piety. Never since the age of the Reformation, has the progress of the Church presented practical questions of more solemn moment, or issues of more thrilling significance for the future. The course of events there now may be regarded as eminently *historical*, in the true and proper sense of this term; which is not reached by any means with the notion merely of passing years and their budget of facts, but implies the idea of actual movement in the world's inward life, the development of tendencies and principles into new results of general and lasting force for the nation and the race. Such palpably is the nature of the great church agitation, which has been for some time shaking England to its centre, and the end of which no one is able yet to calculate or foresee. It is no superficial or merely transient commotion. It is no play of simply pragmatical contrivance and policy, in the hands of men intent on altogether other ends; however ready the art of courts and political parties may show itself, as in all similar cases, to turn the movement into its own service. Under all such false purposes and aims, the ruling power of the agitation is undoubtedly a true interest of humanity, the working of religion, the most fundamental of all forces in history, in a form which it is quite possible that kings and parliaments may find as much beyond their control at last as the whirlwind itself.

Serious men feel this in England; and they are coming to feel it, more and more, also in other countries. Nor is this feeling confined by any means to those who are members of the Episcopal Church. It extends to all Protestant communions, just in proportion to their intelligence and their knowledge of what is going forward in the world. This itself may be taken as a criterion of the real general historical significance of the problem, which is here in the course of practical solution. It is only what is thus universally significant in its own nature, that has power to engage in this way general attention and concern; and then it is not so much through any personal reflection that this takes place, as in obedience rather to a sort of instinctive consciousness, by which men feel themselves sympathetically

borne along with the authority of such a movement, whether it suit their judgment and taste otherwise to make much account of it or not. It is curious to observe, how this law works in the case now under consideration. With all their professed indifference or hostility to the Establishment, Dissenters of every hue find themselves forced to mix themselves up to a certain extent with its controversies and quarrels, though hardly able to tell in many cases *where* exactly it becomes them to take their position. The Presbyterianism of Scotland too is not able to sit still ; and even the Puritanism of this country, while it affects to despise the whole doctrine of the Sacraments and of the Church as it is here in controversy, sees itself constrained notwithstanding to acknowledge indirectly the deep solemnity of the struggle, as one in which some interest of its own is felt to be ultimately at stake. All this goes to show, we say, the profound meaning and far reaching importance of what is taking place. It is indeed a great crisis in the history of Protestantism, not for England only but for all countries ; and *not* to see and feel the solemnity of it in this view, as we have said before, is to betray by the very fact a sad want of earnestness in religion altogether. Only the ignorant or frivolous can be indifferent to the progress of so great a question.

The critical character of the movement is shown, not only by the general feeling of anxious awe now mentioned with which it is fixing upon itself more and more the gaze of the world, but by the central relation also in which it stands plainly to the bearings of previous history. It is no sudden excitement, that comes no one can tell whence and looks no one can tell whither. In all parts of the world, Protestantism has been for some time past in a course of inward preparation, either theoretically or practically, for just such a powerful reaction in favor of the old idea of the Church, with its corresponding principles and doctrines. There must have been in this way a mighty predisposition in the English mind towards Catholicism, or at least a mighty dissatisfaction inwardly with Puritanism, to account at all for the rapid growth of the Tractarian system, since its first appearance fifteen years ago in Oxford. It is easy enough moreover to point out powerful tendencies, which have been working either negatively or positively in other lands also, in the same general direction. The time has not yet fully come indeed, to estimate these in their whole strength. But it is plain enough, for all thinking men, that the problem of the Church Question, as it enters into the controversy between Catholics and Protestants, has been for some time past challenging reconsideration

and demanding new settlement ; and that this call is powerfully enforced from all sides, by what we may style the whole experience of the age, in a political and secular as well as ecclesiastical view. The English movement falls in with this wide spread and manifestly providential tendency, as it is clearly also the fruit of it and one of its most startling and awakening results. This of course shows again its vast historical significance and force. It lies at the very heart undoubtedly of the general life of the age ; and it is all in order accordingly, that the earnest and thoughtful, who stand in the nearest sympathy always with this life, should regard what is passing with more than usual interest and concern.

Taking the controversy in the broad view now noticed, there is no reason whatever for restraining this interest to the bounds of the Episcopal Church. The question in agitation is something far deeper at last, than the proper view to be taken of the Protestantism of this particular body, or of its rights and claims over against the Church of Rome. It looks directly to the whole constitution of Protestantism, and grapples at once with the deepest and most universal issue that holds between it and Romanism. Episcopacy here becomes a mere circumstance ; it may be in itself an element of some considerable account for the final settlement of the subject in hand, but it is still a secondary and subordinate particular only, and by no means the central or main thing, the very root and marrow, as some affect to think, of the whole question that is to be solved. To make it so, either on one side or the other, is sheer pedantry of the poorest and most pitiful kind. The question which lies at the heart of this movement, and communicates to it all its depth and power, is of no such shallow range. It goes far below this, to the very foundations of the whole cause of the Reformation. It is not necessary that one should be an Episcopalian, to feel himself brought into direct contact with its vastly solemn scope. He may feel this also, and ought to feel it, as a Presbyterian, as a Methodist, and even as a Congregational Puritan. For under every such character, he is still bound to take a lively interest in all that concerns the general constitution of that common Protestantism, out of which these unfortunate distinctions spring. And this interest is due to the case before us, independently altogether of the view that may be taken of the main question in debate. Let it even be supposed, that the whole drift and aim of the Catholic tendency is false, and that the true perfection of Protestantism is to be sought only in its being stripped of the last shred of churchly feeling, (after the taste of the Baptists,)

then will there be only the more reason of course to watch anxiously the progress of the present movement, and to look forward earnestly to the day when this desirable consummation shall be reached. The sacramental and the unsacramental alike have a deep interest at stake, in the present transitional crisis of the Anglican Church ; and just in proportion to their earnestness, may they be expected accordingly to turn towards it their most solemn regards.

Of the last class we know indeed that there are many, who make it a point to treat the whole subject with an air of easy superiority and disdain ; as though there were no room in truth for any rational controversy in the case, and so of course no ground for apprehension with regard to its ultimate issues, and no occasion therefore for any special interest in its progress. It is wonderful really how easily and how soon this unchurchly and unsacramental school in general are able to make a full end of this deepest problem of the age, and to gain a height of serene conviction in relation to it, that sets them quite beyond the reach of all the doubts and difficulties that seem to surround it for minds of another cast and make. To *them* the whole church question, as it now disturbs the peace of England, is nonsense and folly ; they see to the bottom of it at once, and only wonder that men of education and sense in the English Church should find the least trouble in bringing it to its proper solution. Romanism is a tissue of abominations and absurdities from beginning to end ; Puseyism is made up of silly puerilities, that cannot bear the light of common sense for a single moment ; and it only shows the misery of Episcopacy and the English Establishment, that it should have given birth to so sickly a spawn at this late day, or that it should now find it so hard to expel the thing from its bosom. The proper cure for all such mummary is to give up the church mania altogether, to discard the whole idea of sacramental grace, to fall back on the Bible and private judgment as the true and only safe rule of Protestantism, and to make Christianity thus a matter of reason and common sense. This too is clearly the order and course of the age ; all is tending, by political and ecclesiastical revolution as well as by the onward march of science, towards this glorious result of independence and freedom ; and it may well be expected therefore, that all these church crotchets will soon follow the other rubbish of the Middle Ages into the darkness of perpetual oblivion and night.

But it is just one of the great uses of instruction to be drawn from this movement, that it is eminently suited to convict all

such flippant thinking of falsehood, and to expose it for the seriously thoughtful in its true nakedness and poverty. The entire history of Christianity indeed, for one who is able to study it, is replete with instruction in the same form ; it is impossible to have any tolerable familiarity with it, and not be filled with a sort of moral nausea towards all such crude and empty declamation, as being a libel on its whole divine significance from the start. But it is well to have the lesson brought home, as it is here, to the very door of our own life and day. And no one will pretend, that it is not so here under a form that carries with it extraordinary weight. So much is this the case, that even the class of whom we now speak, with all their self-complacent flippancy, find themselves forced, as we have already seen, to do some homage instinctively to the inherent solemnity of the crisis which is passing. With all their tone of contempt for it, they have no power to avert from it absolutely their eyes, or to speak of it with calm indifference ; which they should be able to do certainly, if it were in its own nature really so puerile and weak as they pretend. And who may not see, that the instinctive feeling here is more to be trusted, than the empty judgment to which it gives the lie. If ever a movement deserved to be honored, for its religious earnestness and for the weight of intellectual and moral capital embarked in it, such title to respect may fairly be challenged by this late revival of the catholic tendency in the English Church. The movement is of far too high and ominous a character, has enlisted in its service far too great an amount of powerful intellect and learning and study, and has gone forward with far too much prayer, and fasting and inward spiritual conflict, and has taken hold far too deeply of the foundations of the best religious life of the nation, and has led and is leading still to far too many and too painful sacrifices, like the dividing of soul and spirit or of the joints and marrow—to be resolved with any sort of rationality whatever into views and motives, so poor as those which are called in to account for it by the self sufficient class of whom we now speak. To charge such a movement with puerility, to set it down as destitute of all reason and in full contradiction to the clear sense of religion, as a mere rhapsody of folly without occasion or meaning in the proper history of the Church, is but to make ourselves puerile and silly in the highest degree. Plainly it is the part of true wisdom, rather to pause before such an imposing fact with a certain measure of reverence, whether our sympathies fall in with it or not, to study it carefully in all its proportions, and thus to turn it to some purpose of instruction and profit that may be

helpful in the end to others as well as to ourselves. There is no excuse for treating such a fact with mere ribaldry and scorn. We are bound in all right reason, as well as in all good conscience, to take it for granted that it is not without meaning, whether we have power to understand the sense of it or not. It is high time, we think, in view of what has taken place already in the history of this Anglican movement, and of what is now taking place—not to speak of events that are as yet only casting their shadows before them—that our popular declaimers on the subject, whether of the rostrum or the press, should pull in their zeal a little, and learn to proceed somewhat more moderately in their philippics and squibs. They are, in the usual style, quite too wholesale and sweeping. All excess at last cuts the sinews of its own strength; an argument which proves too much destroys itself; and so there is some reason to apprehend, that this anti-catholic and anti-sacramental ammunition may in the end lose its effect altogether, by being simply pushed too far and so made vile and cheap. The method is indeed short and easy, and answers an admirable purpose especially for our May anniversaries, where many of the orators, as we all know, would be sadly at a loss to get along at all, without the opportunity of such wholesale never-come-amiss vituperation of Romanism and Puseyism, with all that belongs to the sacramental system. But for all this, it is high time, we say again, that men who lay claim to so large a portion of all the knowledge and piety that are going, should begin to be a little more reserved at least in the practice of such polemics, as being more and more likely to make an impression on thinking people the very opposite of that which they themselves seek and wish.

We do not mean of course, that the personal credit of the party embarked in the Tractarian cause, whether still in the Church of England or gone over to Rome, is to be taken as an argument for the truth of the cause itself; or that this is to be made right and good, by any consideration simply of the learning and piety, the labors and sacrifices, which it has had power thus far to engage in its service. There are learning and piety also on the other side; and the question is not to be settled at once by any proof of this sort in either direction. All we mean is, that a cause which is thus circumstanced is no fit object of wholesale contempt. It has a right to be looked upon with respect, and to challenge sober and serious examination. More than this, it must include in its constitution some real meaning and reason, well entitled to consideration, which it is perfectly certain that those have never yet come to see or understand, who

affect to dispose of its pretensions in any such summary and sweeping style.

The catholic and sacramental tendency in religion is something too great, to be set aside lawfully by a flippant dash of the tongue or pen, or by a mere magisterial wave of the hand. All superficial criticism here is egregiously out of place. Never was there a case, in which it could be less reasonable and becoming to sit at the feet of fools for instruction ; and it is truly humiliating to see, how readily this is done by a large part of the nominally Protestant world, to whom every strolling mountebank is welcome that comes among them as a lecturer on Romanism ; as though the deepest and most sacred themes of religion, and questions that have carried with them the earnestness of death itself for the most earnest and profound minds age after age, might be satisfactorily settled in five minutes' time with a flourish of idle declamation, by men whose want of serious thought is as it were visibly stamped on their whole face. Such championship of Protestantism is of course disgraceful, and tends directly to kill its own cause ; on which account we are not much surprised to learn, that a somewhat, notorious renegade brawler of this sort, who is now scouring the country, has come to be regarded by some with suspicion as being possibly himself still only a cunning Jesuit in disguise. But the championship may be of a much more respectable order than this, and yet fall fairly notwithstanding under the same general charge of frivolous superficiality. It may proceed, not from fools and blackguards but from men of respectable education and apparently very serious piety, and yet be of such form and spirit throughout as to show manifestly, that it is dealing with a subject which it has never taken any serious pains to understand, and the merits of which therefore it has no power either to fathom or explain. So it must ever be, where it is assumed from the outset that the subject carries in it no real difficulty, that two or three obvious common sense maxims are sufficient to settle it immediately and entirely one way, and that it is only a sort of palpable hallucination to think seriously for a moment of settling it in any other way.

In the case before us, all such sweeping criticism, we repeat, is in danger more and more of fairly capsizing by its own spread of sail. Of this some seem to be growing at least partially aware, and we notice accordingly in the late Tabernacle oratory, as reported in the newspapers, an occasional lowering of the usual high tone in regard to the intrinsic folly and wickedness of the whole Catholic system. A few of the best speakers have

condescended to acknowledge, that this system is not so utterly destitute of all sense and piety as is often imagined, that the main power of it after all lies in the appeal it makes to some of the higher principles of our nature, and that it may be found in this way to carry in it a perilous charm, a true siren's voice, even for religiously earnest and learned men, nay, for this class perhaps, in certain states of thought, beyond all sorts of people besides. "The sacramental system," in the language of one of these speakers, "is susceptible of such an expression, that its repulsiveness may be concealed, and it may be rendered attractive and full of spiritual meaning; and this was the reason why it attracted many of the learned and refined. It was impossible to read the Oxford tracts, or to converse with some of those who had gone from among us, and not feel that Popery is a system that may be rendered attractive to certain minds. But, nevertheless, it is a false system; and it is in this *plausible* aspect that it needs to be met, as a false theory." But even this sort of concession, we feel bound to say, gentlemanly as it is in comparison with the tone too often adopted by others, falls altogether short of the respect that is justly due to the subject, and that *must* be felt as well as professed towards it, before it can be approached in any case with truly successful controversy and debate.

The air of *condescension* here is quite too palpable, implying as it does the sense of most complete personal superiority to the entire issue in hand, to allow the supposition that there has been any real mastery after all of its proper difficulties and merits. No man can be justified in the use of this tone in such a case, we say it respectfully but still with the most firm decision, who has not been led in the first place through much profound thought and earnest prayer to the platform on which he is brought finally to stand; and then the fruit of his experience will have been such, beyond all doubt, that it will be morally impossible for him not to allow a great deal more still in favor of the system, which he ventures thus intelligently and not blindly to condemn. It is not enough, to say that the sacramental system is very childish, and contrary to the Bible, and at war with the whole idea of evangelical religion; but that we may easily see still how it can have charms for persons of a sentimental and poetical turn of mind; and so are bound to acknowledge the learning and religious sincerity of many who are now yielding themselves to its power, while we pity and deplore their blindness as contrasted with our own light. The apology itself, in any such form, is intolerably superficial and slim. It may go down, as a nice

morsel of philosophical wisdom, with some dreamy audience of the Broadway Tabernacle, but it can never bring any true and solid satisfaction to wakefully inquiring souls that hunger after truth. All such see at once, that it needs something more than sentimentalism to explain a movement so vast and deep. The very fact that the system in question has carried in it such power, through all past times, to lead captive the minds of the cultivated and learned, as well as of the rude multitude, and that it is doing this now in so earnest a way, should be taken as itself solemn proof that it is not without some sort of cause and reason, in the religious wants of men and the revelation of grace with which they are met in Christianity. Why should the system be so hard to destroy, and whence should it have come to so powerful a revival in the very bosom of Protestantism itself, and by what means shall we account for its energy and zeal, if it be in itself after all so void of reason, and so diametrically opposed to every right conception of religion, as is taken for granted even by the more liberal representation of which we now speak. No such system could ever so prevail, if it were altogether without reason. No such system could so turn the heads of the best scholars in the English Church, if it were made up of mere puerilities and dreams. No such system could produce so much uncommonly earnest fruit, in the way of fasting and prayer and sacrifice, if it were a simple trick of Satan got up to put down Christ. Every assumption of this sort is violent, outrages reason, and flies in the face of clear facts; and no opposition which is made to the system on any such ground, however respectable it may be in other respects, will be found of any true weight in the end. We have a right to say to such opposition always: "You have never yet so studied this system, as to be justified in using towards it the tone of superiority with which you affect to speak: It may be open to censure in the form here noticed, and it is in truth of the utmost account, in such case, that its faults and defects should be brought fully and clearly into view: But *you* evidently are not yet prepared for any such work: Your supposed superiority to the party on whom you pretend to sit in judgment, is imaginary only and in no sense real: You must think more a great deal, pray more, wrestle more, before you can deserve to be regarded as in any state answerable at all in these respects to the moral weight of the movement on the other side: That all is so clear and easy to your view, only shows how dark in fact your view still is: The first and most necessary condition for fighting Puseyism, and Popery to purpose, let it be well understood and borne in mind,

the most indispensable *sine qua non* of all right to be heard in the controversy at all, is power to perceive and acknowledge the vast body of awfully solemn and most deeply interesting and vital truth, which enters into these systems, and clothes them with their strange and mysterious authority for so many earnest minds."

What makes this Anglican crisis particularly solemn for serious thinkers, is the force it has to bring out sensibly the difficulties and contradictions that belong to the present state of the Church on different sides. In this respect, it may be taken as of a truly diacritical nature; for it goes to probe and expose the doubtful character at least of much, which was before rested in with a sort of passive acquiescence as good and sufficient, simply because it was put to no practical inquest and trial. It sometimes happens that what has seemed to work well enough for ages in this way, is at last suddenly found wanting, to the view of all who do not choose wilfully to shut their own eyes, by some new experiment it may be of a very few years; a particular turn of juncture in history, that serves of itself all at once to bring out, with glaring revelation, huge flaws and defects of which the world generally seemed to have no sense whatever before. Such a juncture, to our view, in the progress of modern church history, is the movement now under consideration. It is in this light especially, that we look upon it as eminently entitled to attention, and as more than usually pregnant with instruction.

Who that thinks seriously, for instance, can fail to be struck with the fearfully ominous posture, into which the whole open and professed no-church interest is thrown by the progress of this controversy. By such interest we do not mean of course those who repudiate the name and notion of a church out and out, but that large class of Protestants rather which has come to look upon the Church as only a notion or a name, disclaiming all faith in its proper supernatural character as we find this asserted in the Apostles' Creed. The opposition which holds between this sort of religion, whether on the outside of the Episcopal church or in the bosom of it, and the old catholic faith, has been all along felt; but there has been room generally for a certain amount of vague uncertainty and disguise in the case, which has kept the full sense of the issue always more or less out of sight. The no-church interest contrived too commonly not to come to any clear understanding with its own theory, finding it more convenient to take the general orthodoxy of it for granted, and to assail negatively the views of the other side at given points as unevangelical and absurd. But one grand effect now

of the crisis which is going forward in England, is to put a full end to all such dubious and deceitful twilight, and to drag this question so into the blaze of day, that all men may see and know where they stand with regard to it, and judge of themselves and of one another accordingly. The main significance of the crisis lies just here, that it goes so thoroughly to the heart and core of the church question, and shuts men up to the necessity of answering it in a direct way, if they answer it at all, with full view of what their answer means.

The force of the question in the end is nothing less than this: Whether the original catholic doctrine concerning the Church, as it stood in universal authority through all ages before the Reformation, is to be received and held still as a necessary part of the christian faith, or deliberately rejected and refused as an error dangerous to men's souls and at war with the Bible? No one will pretend to say surely, that this is not a great question, and worthy of being met with a feeling of sacred awe. It is so, whatever view we take of the proper answer; for let it be considered never so plain and certain, that the rejection of the old doctrine is required by common sense, and that to uphold it is the perfection of folly and superstition, it is still something exceedingly solemn to come in this way to full rupture with a creed, which has been of such wide dominion and of such ancient date, and that must be acknowledged by all too to have been crowned in times past with extraordinary power and fruit. To break faith and communion in this way, not only with such men as Anselm, Bernard, and others of like spirit in the Middle Ages, but with the fathers also of the fifth and fourth centuries, the Gregories, Basils, Augustines and Chrysostoms, who shine as stars of the first magnitude in that older period of the Church, and still more with the entire noble army of martyrs and confessors in primitive times, clear back as it would seem to the very age at least next following that of the Apostles; to break faith and communion, we say, with all this vast and glorious "cloud of witnesses," not on a merely circumstantial point but on a question reaching to the inmost life of christianity itself, is beyond contradiction a thought of such momentous gravity as might well be expected to fill even the most confident with some measure of concern.

Here comes into view the proper significance of the controversy with regard to Baptismal Grace. The idea that the holy sacraments are divine acts, that they carry in them a mystical force for their own ends, that they are the media of operations working towards salvation which have their efficacy and value,

not from the mind of the worshipper, but from the power of the transaction or thing done itself, reaches back plainly to the earliest times of the Church, and has been counted a necessary part of the christian faith by the great body of those who have professed it through all ages. Baptism has been held thus to be for the remission of sins, and to carry with it in some way an actual making over to the subject, on the part of God or Christ, of the grace it signifies and represents. In this view, we find it identified very directly from the first with the idea of regeneration itself. So through the whole period before the Reformation. The mystical sense of the sacrament, and its real relation to the new birth, are everywhere acknowledged, and appear intertwined with the universal system both of doctrine and worship. The use of infant baptism in particular turns altogether on the assumption of such an objective force in the ordinance, and must be surely undermined indeed, sooner or later, wherever this assumption is renounced. Protestantism in the sixteenth century had no thought of breaking here with the faith of previous ages; and the Baptists of that time were regarded accordingly with little less horror than the Socinians themselves. Luther insisted on baptismal regeneration in the strongest terms. Calvin is more guarded, but very firm also in maintaining the mystical supernatural power of the sacrament, as parallel in full with the virtue he supposed to go along with the holy eucharist. The baptism of infants was continued in the Protestant Church on this ground alone, and has been spoken of from the first as in their case emphatically the sacrament of regeneration. So we have it broadly and plainly represented in the English Liturgy. With Puritanism however, the tendency has been all along to make but little of sacramental grace, and to turn the laver of regeneration in particular into a mere bold figure; and we find it now taking its stand openly and decidedly against the ancient church spirit, in its late Anglican revival, just on the platform of this question, as one of central and main account for the whole controversy to which it belongs. The question in truth is thus central in its nature. It involves at bottom the whole force of the alternative, *Church or No-church*, in the form already presented, as a solemn choice in fact between owning or disowning the creed of all Christendom in former times. And the alternative is brought home in so practical a way, that it is no longer easy to evade the full sense and point of the issue, which is comprehended in it under this broad view. This it is that makes the "Gorham case" of such high moment and far reaching significance at the present time, far beyond what many

see or imagine, not only for the Church of England but for the cause of Protestantism in general.

For let it be well observed, that the controversy now at last regards not simply the use of the word *regeneration*, nor some one sense in which it may be taken on either side, nor the doctrine merely of the English Service Book in any sense, but the whole idea of *baptismal grace*, and along with this the whole conception of sacramental grace in any form, as an objective mystical and supernatural virtue going along with the holy sacraments, in distinction from all states and acts accompanying the use of them in the minds of men. We have no right to make this a question for Episcopalians only or for the English Establishment; as though it were a contest properly only between a high party and a low one in that semi-catholic communion, touching the construction of a few unfortunate clauses in their Liturgy; while other denominations may be considered as out of its range altogether. We ought to see and feel, that it is a question, not for Episcopalians as such only, but for all Protestants.

It comes just to this now more and more plainly, whether the old notion of baptismal grace, as it reigned through all ages before the Reformation, is to be still retained in any sense, or fairly expelled from the bosom of Protestantism as a foreign heterogeneous element which had no business to be there in the beginning, and that never can be brought to amalgamate with it in an inward and true way. The Puritan party in the English Establishment, and still more readily of course the Puritan and Baptist tendencies on the outside of it, are in the way of taking openly and with full consciousness more and more the broad ground, that the doctrine of the Prayer-Book on this subject is a pure superstition, as bad as the old dream of transubstantiation itself, and that the farther the Protestant world can get away from it the better. It was all a pernicious mistake, we are told, that the old church made so much of the supposed mystical force of the institution; there is no particular mystery in it; baptism is a sign simply of spiritual benefits to be received in truth in quite another way; and to attach to it any higher significance, to make it in any view a vehicle of grace, is to endanger seriously the interests of *evangelical* religion. It is to fall into the vortex of the sacramental system, against which the entire evangelical host of God's elect—whether known otherwise as Congregationalist, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Quaker, or what not besides—is bound to exercise watch and wage war forever, as

part and parcel of the policy of Antichrist, to deceive the nations and destroy the Church.

Such is the issue here joined, between the churchly and unchurchly tendencies which are now brought to wrestle, as it were in final deadly conflict, for the mastery of Protestantism, in this great English movement. Need we say, that so apprehended the struggle is one of intense interest and solemn as the grave? We see not how it can well stop, till the question is practically settled, not whether, regeneration in some particular sense of this term is always accomplished by baptism, but whether baptism is to remain a sacrament at all for Protestantism, in the old universal church sense. Sacrament or no-sacrament, is in truth the question to be decided; and decided it will be, with consequences of unutterable moment, accordingly as the Protestant world is brought to rest now prevailing in one or the other side of this ominous controversy. We wonder how any person of serious and intelligent mind can fail to regard the controversy, in such view, with profound solemnity and concern. For let it be taken as indeed destined to settle finally the question now presented, the question namely whether Protestantism is a "sacramental system" at all, or carries in it any acknowledgment whatever of sacramental grace, as this idea runs through the whole previous faith of the Church back to the days of Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Apostles, and who may not see that it is in fact a crisis for the whole Protestant cause, (and not for Episcopacy only,) equal to any perhaps through which it has been called to pass since its origin in the sixteenth century. In the naked and broad form in which it has come up for practical decision in the English Church, we are not surprised at all that so many of the best men in that communion have been led to look upon it as the very Thermopylae of the whole church controversy, a question of life and death in truth for English Protestantism. It is only surprising that Evangelical Dissenters so generally, as well as Low Church Episcopalians, should have so little power apparently to look at the crisis in the same way. That the Baptists should desire to see the last trace of the old sacramental system obliterated from Protestant Christianity, is all in order; but how can Lutherans and the Reformed, Methodists, Presbyterians, or even Congregationalists of the old stamp, fall in with their perfectly unchurchly humor, and not be struck with some feeling of anxiety and dread at the thought of making Protestantism by its own voice and vote constitutionally baptismal and unsacramental, in any such open revolutionary style? Can they look the present issue solemnly and steadily in the

face, and say : " Away with this whole doctrine of the mystical objective force of baptism ; we hold it for no part of pure Protestantism ; we deliberately renounce here all fellowship with the Holy Catholic Church of other ages, and with the clear sense of the ancient creeds, and count it a gain for evangelical religion to get clear also of all such obsolete mystification as we find on this subject even in Luther, Calvin, and the English Prayer-Book." Is *this*, we say, what such warfare against the sacramental system means ? Is it at last in league with the Baptists and Quakers out and out, for the overthrow of the sacraments altogether ?

So much for the no-church, no-sacrament party of the day, whether in the English Establishment or on the outside of it, whether in Great Britain we may add or in this country. It is exposed here to a sifting probation, which is well adapted to bring out the true nature of its principles, and to make them for considerate men an object of wholesome apprehension and dread. But the crisis carries with it a sifting efficacy also in other directions.

It bears with trying severity on the pretensions of Episcopacy. This system, as it prevails in England and this country, admits either too little or too much for the stability of its own claims.

Take the Low Church ground in its communion, and it sinks at once plainly to the order of the sects around it, which have by open profession discarded the proper church theory altogether ; it is one simply among the various denominations of the christian world, arguing from scripture and reason as it best can for its own peculiarities, but not venturing to make them in any way of the very essence of faith. In this view, Episcopacy becomes at best a simply outward institute, a matter purely of authority and so in truth a matter of mere ceremonial and form ; of the same order precisely with the law and letter of other distinctions, on the strength of which the Baptists, the Scotch Seceders, and such like bodies, are accustomed to make a parade in true Jewish style of their great regard for God's will. The Baptist pleases himself with the notion of his strict conformity to the "*law* of baptism," without note or comment, in the rejection of its use for infants, involving the repudiation of the whole idea of sacramental grace ; while the Episcopalian pleases himself, in exactly the same way, with the notion of following the primitive and apostolical law of church government and worship, by acknowledging three orders in the ministry and the necessity of a public liturgy. This feeling indeed may go so far, that he shall appear to be anything but a low churchman in the assertion

of it; for as the distinction runs most commonly perhaps between high and low here, it regards rather the stress which is laid on this mechanical notion of Episcopacy, than the truth of the notion itself. The low churchman, in this view, rests his cause more on the ground of expediency and rational preference; whereas the so called high churchman affects to build upon the outward precept as the very rock, beyond which no church whatever can be supposed to exist. In this sense, the rigid Baptist is also a high churchman, who counts all baptism a nullity that is not suited to his own scheme; and so too is the stiff Seceder, who refuses to hold communion with such as stick not exclusively to the use of David's psalms. In truth however Episcopacy of this sort is low enough, and the difference between it and that which more generally bears that name, is more circumstantial than real. Nay, it is in some respects more unchurchly even than the other order of thinking, just because it goes more decidedly to resolve the idea of the church into the notion of an external law, and so into mere Jewish mechanism and form. The true high church theory requires something far beyond this, and is virtually surrendered in fact where it is made to rest on any such false and insufficient foundation.

The progress of the present Anglican agitation, extending as it must of necessity do more and more also to this country, is serving powerfully to illustrate and confirm what is now said. The false and suicidal position of that large class of Episcopalians, whose church principles are confessedly only Evangelical Puritanism under the drapery of Episcopal forms, is becoming fast apparent to all men. Their peculiarity of faith and worship is vastly too small, their Protestant inaxim much too large and wide, to justify the ground they take over against the other divisions of God's sacramental host, confessedly as evangelical as themselves. Nor is it any excuse, that all this is a matter of church order for their body, and not directly of their own choice and will. We all know the original meaning of this order; it turns on the old doctrine of no salvation out of the church, and assumes that the measure of the church is its own communion. What must we think then of those who reject every such thought, and yet show themselves as exclusive as though it were still the full object of their faith? It would be far more honest and manly, we think, if the school here noticed, both in England and in this country, would at once forsake Anglicanism as it now stands, and either pass over into the bosom of other denominations, or if more to their taste form a new Episcopal sect in open and free fellowship, (like a part of the Baptists,) with other

sections of orthodox Protestantism. How can they reconcile it with a good conscience, to postpone such an interest as this, with all that is staked upon in their own view for the cause just now of evangelical Protestantism, to the consideration of keeping up what they themselves regard as no better than a shadow and a lie—the Episcopal system claiming the prerogatives of a church, to which they allow it no title in fact! If this bold Puritanic view be correct, the Episcopal system, with its manifold reminiscences and echoes of the old church life, must be regarded as a perfect wilderness of contradictions, from which the party in question, one might suppose, would count it both a privilege and a duty to clear themselves as quickly as possible, for the sake of a purer and better faith. If Protestantism mean what *they* take it to mean over against Rome, they put the whole cause into peril by pretending to stand up as they do for *Episcopalian* Protestantism, as being of any real account for the general interest. Their principles should carry them farther. Admit the force of their logid *quoad hoc*, and no one can see why it should not be of force very far beyond. It is childish wilfulness, to stop where they insist on stopping, and then pretend to play off the exclusiveness of Rome itself towards all who exceed such arbitrary bounds. If we are to have a *Thus far but no farther* in any case, let us be saved from it at least, in all conscience, under every such purely capricious form! Romanism is more reasonable a great deal than Episcopalianism of this stamp, which first sinks its own authority to the same level with that of all surrounding sects, and then breaks fellowship with every sect besides to uphold it, as the imaginary palladium of the Protestant Reformation.

But what shall we say now of that other form of low Episcopacy, which calls itself *high* only because it is more exclusive in theory as well as practice, and lays greater stress on the legal obligation of its system, while the whole is taken still in the light of a merely mechanical appointment or law? We see not truly, how Episcopalianism in such shape deserves to be considered a whit less pedantic, to say the least, than the exclusiveness of the Baptists or Seceders under a like outwardly legal form. In both cases alike, the Divine element in religion is regarded as holding on the outside of it, in the way of precept, rather than in the very bosom of the system itself; the letter is made to go before the life, to underlie it as first in order and importance, instead of being joined with it in concrete union, and so deriving from it continually all its force. Thus the Baptist pretends to be scrupulously exact in obeying the law of baptism, according to his

own view of the particularities belonging to the rite in the time of the New Testament ; the value of it in his eyes, its true use and necessity, is to be sought only in the notion of its being commanded and enjoined by God ; and so he makes a religious merit of following the injunction, as he supposes, to the letter, un-churching practically all others—on the principle that the essence of religion is implicit submission to God's authority as made known by the Bible, and that it is rationalistic to vary from this a jot or tittle in any way. In truth however, the rationalism lies wholly on his own side ; for the factors of his religion in such form are, not the word as life and spirit, and faith yielding to its plastic force, but the dead letter of the Bible merely and his natural intelligence making out of it what sense it best can. So with the greatest scrupulosity for the form and shell of the sacraments, the true heart and inward substance of them are discarded as a miserable superstition ; the circumstantialists of baptism are made to be everything and its proper essential mystery nothing ; the entire conception of the Church, as anything more than a natural human society, falls to the ground ; and the glorification of God's authority in the Bible, (just because it is thus turned into a dead rule for the natural intellect of man to work by,) becomes in the end a horribly grinning satire upon itself, by resolving faith into common sense and subordinating the whole interest of religion to private judgment and private will. It is not by accident, in this view, that the Baptist spirit, loud as it is at the outset in its profession of being more bound than others by the "law and testimony" of revelation, has ever shown itself prone to make common cause in the end with all sorts of rationalistic radicalism in its open assault on the mysteries of Christianity ; as it is not by accident either, on the other hand, that this radical humor, when it affects as it often does to be on the side of Christ, falls in with the Baptist tendency, in thought and tone, more immediately and readily than with any other short of open infidelity—having, with all its veneration for the Bible, the same dislike precisely of the Church, and the same horror of everything like sacramental grace. Such, we say, is the fallacy here of resting the idea of religion on the supposed word of God, taken in the light of a merely outward or legal institute. And now we ask, what better is it than this to make Episcopacy, with its outward succession from the time of the Apostles, in and of itself the article of a standing or falling church—on the principle simply, that Christ and his Apostles are supposed to have prescribed this form, and that we have no right therefore to vary from what must be regarded thus as a

strictly Divine rule? It is possible to take very high ground with this view, to be very aristocratic and very exclusive; but the view itself is low, and proceeds on the want of faith in the proper supernatural character of the Church rather than on the presence of such faith; on which account, the farther it is pushed it only becomes the more plainly empty and pedantic. Being of this character, it is found to thrive best, like all pedantries, in periods of mechanical humdrum and sham; while it is sure to be exposed in its true vanity, when the religious life is called to pass through a great general crisis, as at the present time. The more the church question is agitated in an earnest and serious way, and the more men's minds are fixed on its real meaning, the more evident must it become always that no such mechanical view of it as this can ever solve its difficulties or satisfy its requisitions. And such precisely is the way in which the profound Catholic movement now going forward in England, is making itself felt on the pretensions of Episcopacy in this simply outward style all the world over. It is showing them to be hollow and vain, no better in truth than an idle sham. It is causing the earnest minded, both in that communion and out of it, to see and feel, that either the church rights and prerogatives of which it makes a parade are nothing and form no special property whatever in its case, or that they must have far deeper and more solid ground on which to rest than the order of bishops or the use of a liturgy, regarded as a simply outward appointment. No *jure divino* constitution, in any such style as this, can uphold in a real way for faith the mystery of the one, holy, catholic and apostolical Church. The premises are either too narrow for the conclusion, or else a great deal too wide.

Faith in the Church, in the old ecclesiastical sense, is not a stiff persuasion merely that certain arrangements are of divine appointment, and a disposition to stickle for them accordingly as the lines and stakes that go to fix the conception; it is the apprehension rather of the Church as a living supernatural fact, back of all such arrangements, having its ground and force in the mystery of the Incarnation, according to the order of the ancient creed, and communicating to the marks and signs by which it is made visible every particle of virtue that is in them for any such end. This idea goes vastly beyond the notion of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or any other supposed divine right ecclesiastical polity of this sort; it looks directly to the original promise, *Lo I am with you always to the end of the world*; and lays hold first and foremost of the mystical being of the Church, as no mechanism of dead statutes, but the actual presence of an ever

living revelation of grace, (no less divine than the Bible itself,) a higher order of history, a strictly heavenly constitution on earth, (Christ's *body*, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all,) in virtue of which only, but in virtue of which at the same time surely, all organs and functions belonging to it have also a super-human and heavenly force. This does not imply that such organs and functions may be indifferently in any form, or in no form whatever, (a theory of *invisibleness* that turns the concrete mystery into a pure abstraction,) but it does mean certainly that the organs and functions make not of themselves the being of the body; they are parts only in any case, which owe their whole vitality and vigor to the general system in which they are comprehended, and away from this are of no worth whatever. If episcopacy and a liturgy be found to grow forth conclusively from the nature of the Church, in such catholic view, it is all well and good; let them then come in legitimately for their proper share of respect. But it ought to be plain "unto all men diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors," we think, that the grand weight and burden of the question concerning the nature of the church rest not at all on these distinctions, and that to put them therefore ostensibly in any such form must ever smack of pedantry, and betray a poor and false sense of what this question means. All turns here on the *idea* of the Church, and this not only may, but must be settled to some extent in our minds, before we can go on to discuss to real purpose the divine obligation of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or any other polity claiming to be of such necessary force. Is the idea of a really supernatural constitution under this name, as it once universally prevailed, a sober truth still for Christian faith, or has it become a dangerous though beautiful *fiction*? That is the question; the first and most fundamental question here, before which the whole controversy about bishops and elders, liturgical forms and free prayer, becomes of only secondary account. For it is the answer we give to this question first of all in our minds, that must determine the sense of what we contend for at other points, or show it to be worth contending for one way or another. What is a *jure divino* polity, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, or a *jure divino* system of rites and ceremonies, for a church that shrinks from proclaiming *itself* divine, and that has no faith practically in the supernatural character of its own constitution, as anything more than that of the American Tract Society or any other outward league of evangelical sects! In this view it is, that the question of sacramental grace is more profoundly interesting, than the question of episcopacy. It goes much nearer to

the heart of the main question, the grand ultimate subject of controversy and debate ; for the sacraments are the standing sign and seal of whatever power is comprised in the Church ; and as we think of this, so invariably also will we think of them ; the one conception giving shape and form always directly to the other. But even here the right church sense is something more general and deep, than the right sacramental feeling. The notion of grace-bearing sacraments, sundered from the sense of the Church as still carrying in it the force of its first supernatural constitution, would be indeed magical, and must prove quite as pedantical in the end as a supreme regard for bishops in the same dead way. We must believe in a divine church, in order to believe in divine sacraments, or in a divine ministry under any form.

The feeling of this enters deeply into the Anglican movement ; forms we may say the very soul of it ; and is extended by means of it also far beyond the movement itself, with new and unusual force. This we take to be a great benefit, whatever may be thought of Puseyism, or of the tendency it shows just now to pass over to full Romanism. Be its issues as they may, the question here agitated is in itself of the most vast and solemn import, and we have reason to be thankful that it is thus carried from the mere outworks to the inmost citadel of the cause in debate. This Anglican controversy, and most of all we may say the form it is now taking as an open reconsideration of the controversy with Rome, is in itself and for Protestantism something far deeper than the strife for Episcopacy in the usual style of past times ; no such strife, as holding simply between Episcopacy and Dissent, deserves to be considered of any real account in comparison ; and we may well be glad, that both Episcopalians and Dissenters are now in the way of being forced to see and confess this more and more. The controversy here has to do, not with the accidents and circumstances of Protestantism only, but with the very foundations of its life ; and we rejoice to believe accordingly, that it is fast turning into impertinence, for thoughtful men everywhere, the agitation of the church question in every lower view.

It cannot be denied again, that the course of this controversy, as thus reaching to the very heart and soul of the church question, is powerfully sifting and trying the ecclesiastical pretensions of the English Establishment as a whole. These proceed on the old catholic doctrine of the Church, and claim to be in harmony with it throughout. But the near and close competition in which it is now placed with Romanism, is causing it to appear

in a very different light. Think as we may of the aggressive movements of this last, in themselves considered, it must be confessed that so far as mere general *principle* is concerned the Catholic cause carries with it a better show at least of reason and right than that to which it is so daringly opposed. First in view is the high and solemn question of ecclesiastical supremacy, the true and rightful headship of the Church and its legitimate relation to the State. Who can doubt, but that the ground here taken by Cardinal Wiseman, and the Romanists in general, is of a higher character than that occupied by Lord John Russel and the English Establishment? On one side, the civil power is made to be the fountain of ecclesiastical authority; on the other, this authority is taken to be of an order wholly distinct from that of the State, independent of it, and for its own ends above it—derived originally from Christ, and having its seat perpetually in the spiritual kingdom of which he is the glorious though now invisible head. Can there be any question, which of these two views is most honorable to religion, most congenial to faith, most in harmony with the New Testament, most true to the authority of past history? It has been a great reproach to English Protestantism from the beginning, that it put the King into the place of the Pope, and referred all church offices and functions to him as their ultimate source. For refusing to acknowledge this royal supremacy in the affairs of the church, the Roman Catholics have been subjected in past times to persecutions and penalties, which those who are forever harping on the theme of Protestant liberality, as contrasted with the bigotry and intolerance of Rome, would do well to acquaint themselves with even in a superficial way. In the Establishment itself also, many have felt all along the disgrace and burden of the relation, and have often with feeble voice protested against it or tried to explain it away. But never before probably was there such a glaring exposure of the misery of it, as that which is taking place just at the present time. The whole Tractarian movement has been *against* the notion of such civil supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, in proportion precisely as it involved a revival of church principles generally, and a return to old catholic sentiments and ideas. The Gorham controversy might seem to have been providentially ordered, to bring out in broad caricature and irony the true sense of the farce, when it was sure in this way to receive the most earnest attention. Here, a theological question, not of secondary but of primary consequence—going just now as we have before seen to the very root of Protestantism—is settled in the last instance by purely civil authority; and

the English hierarchy, with his Grace of Canterbury at its head, in the presence of the whole world dutifully succumbs to the insolent and profane dictation! How unlike the spirit of the Third Innocent truly, of Hildebrand, of Anselm, of Athanasius! No wonder the Bishop of Exeter, with such earnestness as he has in his soul, should feel such a crisis. to be tremendously solemn. And now, to set the case in its worst possible light, England beholds in her bosom the sudden revelation of a full Catholic hierarchy, asserting the independence of the church in its own sphere, and taking thus with natural ease the very ground which the Tractarian tendency has been reaching after as necessary and right, but reaching after so far in vain. The contrast could hardly be exhibited under a more noticeable or clearly intelligible form; and it is full of disadvantage to the cause of Anglican Episcopacy.

For let it be kept in mind, what we speak of is not the Papal system as such over against the State system of Queen Victoria and the British Parliament, but the general *principle* merely that enters into this contest. That is capable of being considered and settled without regard to actual forms of administration; and must be so settled indeed, in order to be acknowledged at all in any true way. It is a very important question certainly, whether the headship of the visible church shall be taken to reside in a General Assembly, or an Episcopal Convocation, or a Pope; but of still greater importance than this, because back of it and under it in the order of truth, is the question, whether the church shall be allowed to have any such headship of its own at all, or be regarded as a mere branch and dependency of the civil government, like the judiciary, the army or the marine. This is the question, on which issue is now joined by the Catholic and State Church parties in England; and we have no right to close our eyes to the true significance of the principle involved in it, merely because it may seem to go in favor of Popery here, as they call it, and not in favor of Protestantism. The exodus of the Free Church of Scotland has been widely glorified, as a grand exhibition of martyrdom for the very principle now in view, the independence of the church in church matters, the "rights of King Jesus," as the Scotch phrase it, in opposition to all worldly political power whatever. The fountain of ecclesiastical law and order, the true and proper primacy in matters of religion, was loudly proclaimed in this case to be, not the British throne or parliament, but the supreme judicatory of the church itself; and in defence of this principle, the best men of Scotland, with Chalmers at their head, showed themselves ready

to brave, if need were, the greatest penalties and pains. Puseyism too has gained credit deservedly, for only seeing clearly, and saying plainly, that the civil supremacy in matters of religion is an abuse, at war with every right conception of the church, and for proposing, though thus far only in a weak and ineffectual way, a return to the old doctrine of ecclesiastical independence; and for all right minded men certainly, the Bishop of Exeter just now, by even the partial stand he is trying to make for this doctrine in the midst of the universal defection from it that surrounds him, is a spectacle of more moral dignity than the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the whole bench of bishops besides at his back, truckling in base subserviency to the nod of the civil power. And why then should we refuse to see or own the same moral significance, in the controversy between the Queen and the Romanists? In their own way these last claim the right, (indefeasible in its own nature and now solemnly guaranteed also by the British laws,) to render unto God the things that belong to God, and to carry out the full idea of a church, without dictation from Cesar or dependence in any sort on Cesar's will. But against this, Lord John Russel and the great majority of the English nation loudly and violently protest—calling it Papal aggression, a violation of the proper liberties of the country, an attack on the Queen's supremacy; as though it were not by act of Parliament years since settled, that allegiance to the Pope in things spiritual is perfectly compatible with the acknowledgment of this supremacy in things political, full as much as allegiance to the General Assembly of Scotland. The principle of the controversy thus is clear and plain. And so far as this is concerned, we say, the right is with the Catholics, and the wrong glaringly and grossly on the other side. We sincerely admire for our part the firmness and constancy of the Irish hierarchy in the case of the Government colleges, and the calm intrepidity displayed in the organization of the new hierarchy for England; and only wonder that so many otherwise sensible people should have no power apparently, through the mist of their prejudice against Popery, to look upon the matter in the same light. Let Popery be never so foul and false, in itself considered, it is still something great, in this age of mechanism and sham, to find a large body of men thus solemnly committing themselves on its behalf to the old catholic principle, (very apostolical too, as it strikes us, both in sense and sound,) that powers and rights ecclesiastical, come not from kings or civil parliaments, but from the divine constitution of the church itself upheld and maintained by the perpetual presence of its own head. There can be no

question in this issue, which side answers most impressively to the true ideal of the old church life, as it comes up to our minds when we think of such men as Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, or Augustine. There is a moral majesty in the present position of the Pope's hierarchy both in Ireland and England, which, poor and mean as it may outwardly appear, has the effect just now undoubtedly of casting a very sensible shade on the Queen's hierarchy, in spite of all its pomp and wealth. Why should Wiseman not stand as high here at least as Chalmers? Who among the Anglican bishops or archbishops can be said to present anything like the same imposing and sublime figure?

But the issue here is not simply as between two hierarchies, the one culminating in the Pope and the other in the Queen, in the form now stated; it goes beyond this to the universal question of religious liberty, the right of men to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, the principle of church toleration in the broadest sense; and in this view it concerns directly all sects and parties on the outside of the Government church, no less than the membership of this favored communion itself. Is it not the pride of the age, to be considered liberal, enlightened, tolerant in matters of religion? Is not this in particular the boast of Protestantism? Above all is it not the boast of English Protestantism, whether in Great Britain or in these United States? Has not England moreover only a few years since, after ages of most unrighteous persecution, solemnly *emancipated* her Catholic population, and admitted them to a gracious comprehension in this grand privilege of the nineteenth century? But how now does the case before us comport with all this; in which the first movement of the Catholics to carry out in earnest their own ecclesiastical polity, is met with noise and clamor from one end of the nation to the other, and mob and parliament and church-by-law-established are summoned angrily to unite for the purpose of putting it down! Thus ends the farce of toleration and freedom. One can hardly help being reminded by it of Pharaoh's liberality to the Israelites, when he graciously allowed them to go abroad for the worship of Jehovah, but at once set terms and bounds again to his own grant which made it no better than a hollow pretence. The liberty comes just to this: "You may live and serve God as good Catholics, provided only you consent in doing so to hold your ecclesiastical rights and privileges as a fief in fief from the English crown, and do homage for them accordingly, as is done by the regular government church, to her Majesty the Queen, as

true *Pontifex Maximus* of the British realm." Pagan Rome in the first ages, and the Persian Monarchy in the fourth and fifth centuries, might easily have been reconciled to the church on the same Erastian terms. But no true Catholic of course could so part with the substance of his faith, to be thus graciously *tolerated* in keeping the name of it afterwards and its mere empty shell. Say what men please of it then, the contest now going forward in England, between the Papal and Royal interests, is in truth a contest for religious freedom and the rights of conscience; and the fact is not to be disguised, that in this view, according to the established Protestant doctrine of the nineteenth century—the age of light, the flower of all ages—the wrong is palpably and egregiously on the Protestant side. This is so plain indeed, that the main body of the English nation itself, it seems to us, must soon be ashamed of its false position, and quarrel with its own passion for so upsetting the fair and even tenor of its way. It is only strange that the universal interest of Dissent should not at once have been prepared, to make common cause openly in such a case with the *persecuted* party—so far at least as the principle of religious toleration is concerned. A most curious commentary it is certainly on the reigning song of this class in particular about "freedom to worship God," the inalienable rights of conscience, &c., to find not only the Independents, Baptists and Methodists, of England, but the Presbyterians also of Scotland, holding up their hands for the royal supremacy in matters of religion against the Catholics, while yet professing to disown it for themselves. And what is if possible still more remarkable, even the Puritanism of this country, with all its antipathies for Episcopacy and law religion, is led by its still greater hatred of Popery to lean visibly in the same direction—as though in the presence of this Medusa's head the memory of Plymouth Rock itself should turn to stone! The doctrine of freedom to worship God according to his private judgment and conscience, and without dictation from the State, is good it seems for every fanatic who chooses to act the part of pope or pontifex maximus separately in his own behalf; but it is *not* good for such as acknowledge any such primacy in the Roman Catholic form. The question comes to this in the end; and is it necessary to say, that under such form it wears just now a very bad face, not only for the Protestant Episcopal church in England, but for the cause of Protestantism in general.

It amounts to nothing to say, that the Catholics are themselves constitutionally intolerant and exclusive, and therefore deserve

no toleration from Protestants. That is not the true modern doctrine of toleration—to allow the rights of conscience and “freedom to worship God” only to such as could be trusted to do the same thing, if they had full power in their hands. Tyrants reign and kill on precisely the same maxim. Protestantism is bound here to take the measure of its conduct from itself, and not from abroad, from its own theory of Christianity and not from any that may be held by others.

But Romanism is to be excepted from the law of universal toleration, we are told, on another account. it involves allegiance to a foreign power, and in such view is politically unsafe and so unworthy of trust. The settlement of a religious constitution under such form in the land, not holding as such from the British throne but from the Bishop of Rome, is taken to be an aggression, an invasion of the Queen’s right, which looks finally to treason and revolution, and fully justifies accordingly the most stringent action on the part of the Government to put it down. We have sometimes heard the same cry of the *Republic in Danger*, on this side of the Atlantic also, to get up a crusade against the Catholics, though the trick is happily waxing now rather stale and grannyyish for much effect. The whole plea we hold to be perfectly idle and false. It is not upheld by either reason or history. No part of the English nation has shown itself—even through water and through fire, the persecution of the nation itself, almost forcing it the other way—more true to the government, more loyal and patriotic and worthy of trust in all respects, than just the body of whom we now speak. Nor has there ever yet been given in this country the shadow of an occasion, (other than the noise made by alarmists themselves,) for apprehending the least danger to our civil institutions; and for ourselves, we say it plainly, we believe the acknowledgment of the Pope’s spiritual primacy is just as little at war with a true American spirit, and carries in it just as little peril for our American liberties, as the acknowledgment of any like primacy in in either of the Presbyterian General Assemblies, or in the American Episcopate, or in the private judgment simply of any true blooded Puritan Independent, who holds himself at liberty, if need be, to brave on the plea of conscience all human authority besides.

But into this question it is not necessary to enter at length in this place. What we wish to urge is, the wrong that is done practically to the Protestant cause itself, let the case be as it may with regard to the political character of Romanism, in supposing that this cause may not be left to take care of itself, even where

it has every outward advantage on its side, but is to be cared for only by a system of wardship and police, in which the free action of mind is to be as much as possible forestalled and forced into a given form. The genius of Protestantism, we are told, is not *lucifugous* like that of Rome; it seeks the light, has large trust in common sense and an open Bible, and asks only a clear field and fair play to get the better of Romanism in a short time even in France or Italy itself. Romanism indeed is so absurd as well as wicked, such a dark mass of fallacies and fooleries and vile abominations, that it might seem to have no chance of standing a moment in any such unequal contest, unless under cover of some such Egyptian darkness as brooded formerly over the Middle Ages. But now in the case before us the conditions of this trial are all against it, and in favor of the antagonistic cause. The Protestantism of England is not in its infancy, but of full age and growth, with its roots reaching out in every direction into the soil of the national life. It has learning, and wealth, and vast moral respectability, on its side. The government is in its hands, with boundless patronage and power. What can such a cause fear, thus inwardly and outwardly strong, from an interest so poor and weak and vile as the *thing* called Popery? One might suppose the English nation would only laugh at any show of serious competition, on British ground and in the middle of the nineteenth century, proceeding from such a quarter. And yet, strange to say, the simple érection of a Roman hierarchy, which can never be of more force than the mind and will of the people allow, has been sufficient to throw the nation into a sort of wild panic. There is a solemn self-contradiction in this, and what might seem to be an involuntary confession of weakness, which to the mind of an earnest Protestant, on either side of the Atlantic, can hardly fail to carry with it a somewhat portentous look. And it only makes the matter worse, when piety here turns into patriotism, and affects to be concerned—not just for any peril into which religion may be brought by so contemptible and barefaced an enemy—but for a future and distant peril of the State. This supposed political danger all depends of course, at the same time, on the *growth* of Romanism far beyond its present bounds; and such growth in England can come only by the activity of the British mind itself, exercised on the problem of the two opposing systems under the full meridian blaze of modern knowledge, with an open Bible and all sorts of outward force besides to stem the movement; in which case it would seem as if it must have some *right* to prevail, if a people have any right ever to think for themselves

or to follow their own mind. But the conservative humor of which we now speak, with all its faith in Protestantism, its huge contempt for Romanism, and its high opinion of Anglo-Saxon intelligence and common sense, is by no means willing after all to trust things in this way to their natural course. England must not have the opportunity even of making a fool of itself by turning Catholic, though this should take place with never so much intelligence and freedom: If a man is likely to become a maniac, and in that state to commit suicide, his friends think no harm of chaining him for his own good; and just so here, in view of this possible fit of Romanism and the farther *possibility* by it of political self-destruction, it is held to be wise and right to clap a strait jacket on the patient forthwith, for the benevolent purpose of keeping him in safety from his coming self. The imagination of John Bull is terribly frightened with the chimeras that he is in danger of losing his senses, that his mind is not safe in his own care and keeping; and he comes to the sage conclusion, that the best thing he can do to avoid so deplorable a catastrophe is to part with his mind altogether, to put it into the hands of his own Prime Minister, the British Parliament, the Anglican Bishops, or anywhere in short that may seem fit, only so as to be fairly rid of it himself and in no peril thus of becoming crazy.

What a Circe after all this Popery must be, if the full grown Protestantism of England in the middle of the nineteenth century, with all sorts of patronage and prejudice to back it, may not be allowed to meet the hag or look her fairly in the face, even on its own soil, for fear of being bewitched by her sorceries into the similitude of a swine.

And how kind of the popular spirit now happily in the saddle, which is so well assured of its own sanity and can see this danger afar off, to break through its usual cant of free inquiry and free speech, its favorite cry of liberty and light, and to invoke the strong arm of power for the suppression beforehand of any and all workings of British mind that may look this way.

We have the same spirit in this country, officiously concerned to persuade the American people that Romanism is at war with the idea of a Republic, and that to guard against the danger of itself turning Catholic in time to come, and so by its own free choice committing political suicide, the part of wisdom is now, in obedience to the counsels of this far seeing and profoundly patriotic school, to forestall and cut off the exercise of all freedom in any such form, or in other words, by putting out the

light in season, to save the weak eyes first and then the weak life of the nation.

Seriously, we say, the cause of Protestantism is wronged, the cause of Romanism powerfully complimented, by every concession which implies in this way that there is any danger of an enlightened people, at this time of day, with its eyes open and its hands unbound, being led deliberately to exchange the boasted beauty and perfection of the first for the supposed ugliness of the second, at the cost of losing besides its most cherished privileges and institutions. Such extreme sensitiveness to danger, such spasms of morbid jealousy and fear, where the foe at the same time is represented as so poor and silly, so loathesome and vile, so miserably decrepit and weak, is to our mind we confess one of the most uncomfortable symptoms in the case of Protestantism at the present time. Why should a very ordinary Address of Archbishop Hughes, on its *Decline*, set so many angry pulpits and presses in motion, all over the land, to prove that it is in the full zenith of its prosperity? Why should our evangelical papers, of every denominational hue, feel it necessary to let no week pass without at least two or three squirts of foul water cast towards Rome, when on their own showing it were quite as wise to do battle in the same style with the Grand Lama of Thibet? Why should this English demonstration, which if Protestantism is to be believed in its own favor, deserves to be counted little better than some outbreak of Bedlam, have power nevertheless apparently to move the heart of the Queen of England, and the heart of her people, "as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind?" It would tell vastly more certainly for a cause that takes itself to be so good and strong, over against one that is reproached as rotten to the core and ready to fall to pieces by its own rickety weight, if it could only afford to enjoy this happy feeling of such vast superiority in a calm and quiet way, and with some corresponding self reliance and self-possession. Why should the bellowing of a Roman *bull* disturb, even for a moment, the serenity of the British lion?

The truth is however, that there is real room in the whole case for uneasiness, not just because Romanism may be seen to have power, but because Anglicanism is felt to be weak. The constitutional deficiency of this system, its want of ability to assert and carry out in full the proper functions of a church, is in the way of being exposed as never before by the progress of the present crisis; and so searching has this become in its operation, that there is now good reason to expect that it will lead in due time to the breaking up of the Establishment altogether.

It is becoming more and more difficult for the two tendencies it carries in its bosom, to move in any sort of union together ; and we are not surprised to find that which still makes earnest with catholic truth leaning powerfully towards secession, whether it be to form a new body or to fall into the arms of Rome. The secessions which have already taken place in this last form, are exceedingly significant. No movement of the sort equally grave has occurred since the Reformation. The importance of it lies not just in the number of the converts, though this is serious enough ; but in their character rather, and the circumstances of the change. Newman was the greatest theologian in the English church, and next to him probably Archdeacon Manning. The converts generally have been men of learning and piety, filling prominent stations and connected with the best families. Of their great moral earnestness, the step they have taken is itself the strongest proof. It has been well remarked that every one of them must have gone through a process of fiery probation, of which the world generally can have no conception, to break in such style with his whole previous existence, and pass over through all sorts of sacrifice to his new position. Every single conversion in such circumstances is a true *martyrdom*, in the full sense of the word. No single case of such martyrdom can ever pass without weight ; and in such a time of crisis especially as the present, a hundred cases of the sort coming together must be allowed to carry with them a truly startling and awakening power. It is only the perfection of insipidity to pretend indifference to the fact, in the old world or in the new. The fact itself however, as is well known, is but part of a much wider and still more serious fact. It is no more than the beginning probably of a great church-slide, which is destined soon to shake the whole world with its thundering sound. Nearly two thousand ministers at least are reported as holding ground with regard to the Queen's supremacy, and the late governmental settlement of the question of baptismal regeneration, which will hardly allow them to stay much longer with a good conscience in the Government church. It is difficult to see how Bishop Philpotts can avoid going along with the movement. Such an exodus, whether it may lead at once to Rome or not, must be followed with still more failing of heart and confusion of mind in the Establishment, and with such palpable self-contradiction before the whole world, that it will have no power finally to uphold itself even in form against the forces that are at work on all sides for its overthrow.

In this way it is that the crisis before us, as we take it, is bring-

ing the pretensions of this Established Church to such a course of fiery trial as it has never been called to pass through before ; and the result of the trial is sure to be, that Anglicanism will be found wanting, having no power to make good its own high sounding promises and claims. It is some instinctive apprehension of this, we doubt not, that excites it so much just now against the so-called Papal aggression. With all its superiority of patronage and wealth, and Protestant prejudice to boot, Anglicanism very plainly is afraid to meet Romanism on fair terms, before the tribunal even of the Anglican mind itself. It virtually confesses judgment, and condemns itself by its own verdict. It must either give up the church doctrine altogether, and so fall down openly to the level of the lowest Puritanism, or else be led by it to proclaim itself the sham only of what Romanism has the show at least of being in fact ; and either horn of such a dilemma is " sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." Hard enough it is of a truth, in such circumstances, to be calm and quietly self-possessed. But the exposure is only aggravated by the want of power to meet it in this way. The style in which both parties in the Establishment, High-church and Low-church, allow themselves too generally to rail at Romanism and the late conversions, is anything but dignified or rational, and must in the end rebound with righteous retribution on the credit of their own cause.

It is easy enough to see moreover, that Episcopalianism in general, even as it exists among us here in America, is sorely tried also by this Roman movement in much the same way. It has had already a few secessions of its own, and cannot help feeling at the same time that the secessions in England, and the assumptions that go along with them on the side of Rome, strike directly at the very root of its own life. Hence we have no small display of the same sort of blustering petulant humor that is at work in England ; which however tells all the more badly here, in the case particularly of the high toned church party, that it contrasts so strangely with the bland liberality towards "our Roman sister" which was in vogue in this quarter only a few years since, and finds besides not even an inch of ground on which to build its pretensions in the political constitution of the country. In such circumstances it argues anything but a strong sense of truth and right, anything but real faith in a *jure divino* title, to fall upon nicknames and all sorts of unfounded scandal, the missiles always not of reason but of irrational passion, for the purpose of fighting off the opposite cause.

It is ridiculous for Anglicanism to claim an exclusive right to this country, over against Romanism, unless it be on the ground that this last has lost all church character, and that Anglicanism accordingly is the only true Catholic succession—ground which in fact this communion does not venture to take. What a farce then to talk as if Romanism *here* in America, (whatever it may be in England where Queen Victoria is the fountain of all church unity and life,) could have no right to exist, and must be held only an apostasy and *schism* if it dare to exist, on the outside of the Episcopal communion! “Perverts,” apostates and schismatics, all are taken to be, who fall away from this communion, whether it be to the side of Geneva or of Rome. It sets itself up thus for the one holy catholic church of these United States, out of which on either side there is no salvation. But why then should this same Anglicanism not go to France, or Spain, or even Rome itself, and there play off the same pompous pretence? By what right political or historical does it claim precedence here in such high handed style, that would not be of equal force in Italy or Austria? Why should the true and only valid ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Maryland for instance, originally settled as it was by Catholics, be taken to lodge now in the hands of the excellent Bishop Whittingham only, and not in the See of Baltimore made vacant recently by the death of the no less excellent Archbishop Eccleston? The question may be answered different ways; but let the answer go as it may, it will be found to bear hardly on the cause of exclusive Episcopalianism, involving in one view a great deal too little as in another a great deal too much for its hierarchic claims. In this way, if we are not greatly mistaken, the present course of events is serving to unfold the weakness of such Episcopacy far more than its strength. The stream of the church question, so easy to wade through seemingly at first, is fast getting too deep for the legs of this system to touch bottom, and it must either swim beyond itself or sink. Plainly it has no power to give a satisfactory response to the problem of a truly Catholic Protestantism, the last and deepest interrogation of the present time.

It affords us no satisfaction to come to this melancholy conclusion. We would feel it a great relief rather, to be able to find in Anglican Episcopacy a truly rational and solid answer to the problem of which we speak, an Ararat of rest for the ark of Protestantism, so long drifted by any and every wind over what has been thus far a waste of waters only without island or shore. For most firmly are we convinced, that no *other* sect or fragment of the general movement carries in itself, as such, the power and

pledge of any such rest, or is ever likely to prove hereafter more than a weak approximation at best, on the most narrow and partial scale, to the true ideal and proper perfection of its own cause. The whole reflection is suited to make one sad. But it is still a gain always, to have fallacies exposed and delusions brought to an end; and in this view, as we have said before, there is reason to rejoice at what seems to be taking place in the ecclesiastical world, in the way of historical judgment and dissolution, by the winnowing process that has now begun. It is a great matter to have subordinate issues thrown back on their deepest and last ground, in such sort that men may be compelled to deal with this in a really wakeful and earnest way. So it is coming to be now more and more with the question concerning the true sense of Protestantism, and its right to exist, over against the pretensions of the Church of Rome. There are difficulties in Protestantism, which are not to be settled by the common issues between its sects, let the decision here go as it may. These need to be acknowledged and seriously looked in the face, in order if possible that they may be surmounted or set aside. To make no account of them, is only to make them worse. It is well therefore that the course of history is forcing the world to their solemn consideration, and causing it to see that the right settlement of them calls for something deeper and better than any of the schemes that are now paraded as sufficient for this end.

The day of mere outward tradition here, and blind passive trust in authority, is fast passing away. The mind of the Protestant world is in the course of being roused more and more, to a full revision of the first principles and primordial elements of its own life. What is the real meaning of its *protest* against Rome? Was it in truth, though not so meant at first, a complete rupture with the idea of the Church as it stood before, a full casting off of the old sense of this mystery as it was held for faith in the first ages; in which view Puritanism becomes right, and the best course for ending difficulty would be undoubtedly to give both Episcopacy and Presbyterianism to the winds, and fall over at once in mass to the cool latitude of Baptistic Independency; or is it essential to Protestantism still to carry in it the sense of divine powers, and to assert them in the form of true sacraments and keys that are taken actually to open and shut the kingdom of heaven? And in this last case, can Anglicanism as it now stands be trusted to bear the whole weight of what is thus required, as being under Protestant form, by reason merely of its ecclesiastical machinery, what no Protestantism besides has any power to be under a different shape? And if no

such trust be found to stand, is there no help save in a return to Rome; or may the whole cause of Protestantism be supposed to carry in it the promise of a better future, in which it shall be brought to leave all these difficulties behind, by passing forward to a new and higher position that shall be both Catholic and Protestant at the same time? These are the deep questions that are coming home silently to the inmost heart of the age, by the church agitations of the present time; and so far have thought and doubt been stirred already with regard to them, that we hold it altogether idle and vain to think of a quiet and contented return hereafter to any past habit as in itself conclusive and sufficient. The past is not thus sufficient for the cause of Protestantism, in any part of the world. To say of it that it is so in any of its forms, is only a very bold or else a very ignorant lie; and no such lie now can long satisfy the mind of the age.

The Anglican crisis in this way involves far more than at once appears on its face. It is undermining confidence in much that has heretofore had a show of truth and strength, writing *Tekel* upon it, and turning it for the consciousness of men into mockery and sham. How far this reaches already, or where it shall reach hereafter, no one can tell. One thing is certain; the way is opening for a new revival of infidelity in England, in close connection with the latest and worst form of German rationalism, which is likely to go beyond all that has appeared there under this name before, and which can hardly fail to be felt powerfully also on this side of the Atlantic. It is remarkable too, that this alarming development seems to run in some measure parallel with the revival of the church tendency, as though it formed its natural alternative and reverse. It has entered the Universities, both Cambridge and Oxford. Puseyism in some cases has fallen over, with easy somerset, to sentimental Straussism. The movement includes a brother of *Froude*, and a brother also of *John Henry Newman*. To some, this connection may seem to be an argument against the church tendency; but in truth it is an argument in its favor; for darkness in the moral world follows light always as its shadow, and through the corruption of man's nature what is good is every ready to call forth what is bad, may even to recoil seemingly itself at times into such conclusion, as a sort of Mephistophelian satire on its own beginning. Nor is it at all difficult to see, in the case before us, how the very same need in the course of religious thought, which urges some to lay new stress on the mystery of faith, may throw others into the stream of unbelief, or carry the same persons indeed first in one direction and then in the other. Let the foundations of a reign-

ing creed or habit in religion begin to give way, and there must be of necessity a movement on the part of such as think at all, towards either a more consistent supernaturalism or else a more clearly conscious rejection of the supernatural altogether. This, we doubt not, is just the relation that exists between the revival of infidelity, and what some take to be the revival of superstition, at the present time in England. Both tendencies in truth grow forth from the same ground; both argue the insufficiency of the established tradition, the breaking up of its authority, and the felt necessity of finding for the mind a surer and better resting-place. Both go in this way to show the truth of what we say, in regard to the far reaching character of the religious movement which is now at work. It cannot pass as a mere transient and partial excitement, to be followed by a full relapse afterwards into the old order of life and thought. The hollowness of this has been too far disclosed, all real faith in it is too far gone, to allow any such re-settlement under more than a factitious and hollow form. Politics and the interest of trade may prevail to bring back for a time such a reign of order in Warsaw; but it will be a reign at the same time of violence, of indifference and conscious sham, opening the way certainly to new and greater revolutions in time to come. The idea of the Church must become practically far more than it has been for English Protestantism, or it will inevitably become far less. And this alternative is comprehended itself in a more general issue, which will be found of force finally for the Protestantism of the whole world.

To some it may seem possibly, that putting the matter in this form is equivalent to a full surrendry of the church question in favor of Rome. If it were so, we ought not to shrink certainly from the confession of clear and open truth, just for the sake of avoiding that consequence. Whether we choose to see it or not, the crisis now noticed is solemnly at work, and is sure to lead in the end to its appointed judgment and result. Protestantism must render a plain intelligible answer to the challenge:—"Church or No-church—Sacramental or Non-sacramental—Fidelity to the mystery of the ancient creed, or broad and full rupture with it as the opening revelation only of the Man of Sin?" We will not bear the thought of this answer falling the wrong way, to the side namely of a purely Gnostic naturalism, substituting its own spiritual common sense for the proper mysteries of faith; for that would amount at once to a sentence of condemnation on the whole cause of Protestantism, as complete as any its worst enemies could wish. The problem is then,

How shall the demands of the old Catholic faith be satisfied in true union with Protestant freedom? And for this, we say, no sufficient solution is found in the existing state of Protestantism, as any one may see who is honest enough to look at the matter earnestly with his own eyes. Not in the system as a whole; for it is intrinsically at war in such form with the whole conception. Not in any one part or section of it separately taken, whether in Europe or America. Can any thinking man seriously persuade himself, that Presbyterianism, under any of its multiplying constitutions, or Methodism, or American Lutheranism, or such chaos as now represents the notion of the church in Germany, carries in it the last sense of Christianity, and is in the way of solving hereafter the full burden of its awful riddle for the world's universal use? Can this be hoped of Anglicanism, or such Episcopacy as we have from this source in our own country? The times are working out a negative reply, in tones that are too loud to be overlooked and too clear to be misunderstood. Anglicanism can never cause itself to be accepted, with general faith, as in and of itself an adequate solution for the great church problem of the present time. These we say are *facts*, which we have no right to blink, let them lead where they may. The ostrich changes no truth, by simply plunging her own silly head into the sand. A cloud of arrows shot into the air may darken for a moment, but have no power to put out, the keen light of the sun.

There are however not simply two general alternatives here, but we may say four. The first is a deliberate giving up of the sacramental system altogether, the only proper end of which—short of parting with the Trinity and the Incarnation—is Baptist Independentism, the extreme verge of unchurchly orthodoxy. The second is full despair of Protestantism, and reconciliation in form with Rome, as we have it exemplified with thrilling solemnity in the present English secessions. A third way of escape may be sought, in the belief or hope of a new miraculous dispensation on the part of God himself, through some special agency armed from his presence with fresh apostolical commission and corresponding powers, such as may supersede at once both Romanism and Protestantism as systems that have become historically powerless and dead. Swedenborgianism plants itself on this ground; and it is the ground taken also by Irvingianism—a far more respectable and significant birth of the modern church life than many, having no insight into its natural history, are disposed to allow; not to speak of the wretched caricature we have of the same tendency in Mormonism, which

also in its own way claims to be a revival in full of the otherwise lost gifts and powers of the apostolic age. A fourth and last resort is offered, the only one it seems to us which is left for the thoughtful, in the idea of historical development; by which, without prejudice to Catholicism first in its own order and sphere, or to Protestantism next as a real advance on this in modern times, though with the full acknowledgment of the faults and views of both systems, it is assumed that the whole present state of the church is transitional only and interimistic; and that it is destined accordingly through the very crisis which is now coming on—not just by a new miracle setting aside the whole past as a dead failure, but in the way of true historical progress, which makes the past always the real womb both of the present and the future—to surmount in due season the painful contradictions, (dialectic *thorns*.) of the Protestant controversy as this now stands, and so to carry it triumphantly forward to its own last sense, (the type neither of St. Peter nor of St. Paul but of both rather as brought together by St. John.) in some form that shall be found at the same time to etherealize and save, in the same way, the last sense also and rich wealth of the old Catholic faith.

One of the most interesting and richly suggestive books that have appeared in our times, is Thiersch's Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism, (*Vorlesungen über Katholicismus und Protestantismus von Heinrich W. J. Thiersch*, son of the distinguished grammarian of this name, and professor of theology in the University of Marburg).¹ Through this whole article we have had it more or less in our eye, though it takes no reference directly to the course of things in England; and it is not impossible that we may make it hereafter the basis of another article on the same general subject, in the way of carrying out still farther the momentous discussion to whose threshold we have now come. It detracts not at all from the interest of the work in question, that its highly accomplished and most amiable author, since the first edition of it was published in 1845, has been led to adopt the third general answer, just stated, to the great question of the age, by espousing the cause of the Irvingites, which strangely enough has won for itself in Germany quite a number of converts. This fact rather only goes to show the more affecting the trying nature of the subject, and the deep earnestness of the man. The frivolous and superficial not seldom find all

¹ Author also of the best work we have ever seen on the Canon of the New Testament. a. 1845, in opposition to the destructive criticism of the Tübingen school.

easy, where the truly serious in proportion it may be to the very amount of their knowledge itself are brought into the greatest straits. No one can question the learning of Thiersch; it is of the very highest order. And just as little room is there to question his piety and profound practical sincerity. He wrestles with the problem of his book evidently, not merely as a theoretic scholar, and much less as the organ merely of a theological party, but as one who feels that issues of life and death are suspended for himself and for the world on its proper solution. No one can follow him, without feeling that the subject is full of embarrassment, as well as big with importance, and that it is regarded throughout by the lecturer himself, whatever it may be for others, with intense interest and concern. When we hear of such a man seeking refuge from the difficulties of the church question, by falling in with the belief that nothing less than a new apostolate, sent forth with fresh commission directly from Christ himself, can restore Christianity to its proper form, and that such new apostolate has in fact appeared of late among the Irvingites—we may be well assured that there is here truly a *nodus vindice dignus*, that the difficulties in consideration are neither few nor of light account, and that to meet them properly is a task which calls for more than common earnestness in any part of the world. It is hardly necessary for us to add, that we have no sort of faith in the solution of the knot in this way. No scheme can command our regard, which nullifies virtually the doctrine of the indestructible life of the church, as well as the Divine promise on which that doctrine rests, by assuming a full failure and frustration of all the sense the church had in the beginning. We have no patience on this ground with that bald Puritanism, which fairly buries the church for a thousand years and more, in order to bring it to a more striking resurrection in the sixteenth century. As little can we be satisfied, on the same ground, with the visions of Emanuel Swedenborg; they proceed throughout on the assumption that the church as it started with the Apostles has run itself out, both as Catholicism and Protestantism, and that the world is to be helped now only by a new revelation appointed to take its place. Irvingism involves more or less distinctly, as it seems to us, the same dismal thought; and if this be so, it needs no other condemnation. If it come to a necessary choice between such a view and Romanism, the advantage lies decidedly we think on the side of this last. It is easier to believe that the original powers of the church still flow in this communion, though hidden for the most part from our common Protestant sight, than it is to suppose that they have

perished entirely, and now need a "*Lazarus come forth*," or a second edition of the word "*On this rock*," to come once more into full play for the salvation of a dying world. But, as we have seen, we are not thrown at once on any such desperate election. We may cast ourselves upon the theory of historical development, so as to make Protestantism itself, with all its painfully acknowledged miseries, the main though by no means exclusive stream, by which the general tide of the original Christian life is rolling itself forward, not without fearful breaks and cataracts and many tortuous circuits, to the open sea at last of that grand and glorious ideal of true Catholic Unity, which has been in the mind of all saints from the beginning.

It is but fair to add in the case of Thiersch, for whom we entertain a more than common affection and respect, that he is by no means unhistorical in his own mind, but altogether the reverse; and that so far as the objection here noticed has any weight, it is to be regarded as holding by implication only against the system, in whose plausible meshes he has allowed himself to be recently caught. His theory agrees in many respects with the scheme of historical development; only he counts it necessary to include in this the idea of such a failure of the first life of the church, as makes it necessary now that it should be called forth again from the grave as it were of its own past history by a second supernatural gift of the same sort. J. W. N.

MAYER'S CHURCH HISTORY.¹

THE title of this work is not to be judged exactly from the contents of the volume here offered to the public. It belongs rather to the whole plan, of which in the mind of the excellent author the present volume was intended to be only the threshold or vestibule. The history of the Reformed Church of Germany, in the strict sense, belongs to a later period, which it would have been necessary to take up in a separate volume, had the author been spared to execute his full task. As it is, the work before us is a History of the Swiss Reformation, and this only in part; for it does not come down even as far as to the death of Zuingli, but stops short with the posi-

¹ *History of the German Reformed Church.* By REV. LEWIS MAYER, D. D. Late Professor of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church in the United States. To which is prefixed a *Memoir of his Life*, by Rev. ELIAS HEINER, A. M. Minister of the First Reformed Congregation in Baltimore. Volume I. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. Pp. 461, 8 vo.

tion into which things were brought at the close of the year 1525. On this first chapter of Helvetic Protestantism, however, it contains much that is not to be found in ordinary church histories, at once both interesting and instructive. The book is brought out in very handsome style. Mr. Heiner's Memoir of Dr. Mayer appeared in the last number of our Review; and we cannot do better now perhaps, in bringing the History itself before our readers, than to present in full the brief *Preface* with which it is introduced from the same hand.

PREFACE TO DR. MAYER'S HISTORY.

One of the greatest events which ever occurred among mankind, was the Reformation at the commencement of the sixteenth century. For a long time, the grossest abuses, both in Church and State, had everywhere prevailed. The pope had audaciously assumed the supremacy belonging to Deity himself, in spiritual matters; and now he assumed the supremacy in worldly matters also, giving the kingdoms of the earth, far and near, to whom he pleased. This completed in his person the character of "Antichrist, sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself as God." To such lengths in blasphemy and wickedness did he proceed, that he *sold indulgences to sin*. Making use of the power which his predecessors had usurped over all Christian churches, he sent abroad, into all kingdoms, his letters and bulls, with ample promises of the full pardon of sin and eternal salvation to such as would purchase the same with money. The cup of his iniquity was now full. God raised up **ULRICK ZWINGLE** and **MARTIN LUTHER**, to check the Man of Sin in his impious course, and to beat back the fearful tides of corruption which were now sweeping over the earth and deluging the church. Enlightened by the word and Spirit of God, they began to cleanse the church from the pollutions and abuses of popery, and to spread abroad among the people the blessed knowledge of the word of God. As the truth spread far and wide, tens of thousands were subdued by its power, and whole churches, and whole communities, and, at length, whole nations, awoke from their long spiritual sleep, and were led to rejoice in the great salvation of the Scriptures. The event of the Reformation produced a new and glorious era in the church and in the world, and its beneficial results will be felt by mankind, to the latest age. Whoever, therefore, largely contributes to the better understanding of its origin and progress, may be regarded as a benefactor of his race.

The volume which is herewith offered to the public is a complete and an ably written history of the Reformation in Switzerland, the birthplace of the church, as reformed by Zwingli and

his able coadjutors. It is generally known that the reverend author was engaged in writing the history of the German Reformed Church, and that the first volume, embracing the origin and progress of this church,—and, incidentally, of the Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, and Presbyterian churches also,—was ready for the press. For some years, this important work has been anxiously expected. Except D'AUBIGNE and EBRARD, no church historian, it is believed, has done justice to the noble Swiss reformers, and to the people whom they converted, under God, from the abominations of popery, and organized into comparatively pure Christian churches. Neither their character nor work seems to have been properly understood. The want of a good history of the German Reformed Church, in the English language, has long been felt; and it is, therefore, gratifying to know that the work before us is supposed to answer well the demand in question. Among other things of interest and importance, it does ample justice to ZWINGLE, BULLINGER, ŒCOLAMPADIUS, BUCHER, and, indeed, to all the great and distinguished men who originated, and carried on with so much ability and success, the glorious reformation in Switzerland. At the same time, it does full justice to LUTHER, MELANCTHON, CALVIN, and others, in its notices of the reformation in Germany, France, and other countries. All denominations of Christians, but especially the churches of the Reformation, will read this work, it is believed, with pleasure and profit. The high origin and deeply interesting history of the German Reformed Church are here brought fully and clearly to the view and consciousness of the reader.

The second volume of the work, designed to embrace the history of the German Reformed Church in the United States, is not fully written out, and will have to be completed by another hand. Much time and great labor have been expended on it, and the history, making thus far perhaps three hundred pages, comes down to about the year 1770. A great portion of the material for the remainder is collected, and partly arranged. The Synod of the German Reformed Church, at its late meeting in Martinsburg, Va., recommended the completion of this volume, and also the publication of the one now offered to the public.

The author was not permitted, in the order of Providence, to witness the publication of the work, upon which the last years of his useful life were expended, but his own memory is embalmed in the annals of the German Reformed Church. Whilst he rests from his labors, the influence of his work will be perpetuated by this valuable contribution to the history of the church which he loved and served during a long life devoted with patient self-denial to its best interests, and to which, in death, he has bequeathed a legacy that will be appreciated by all candid Christians.

Baltimore, Md.

E. H.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. V.

BAILEY'S FESTUS.

FESTUS: *A Poem*, by PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. Barrister at Law. Ninth American Edition. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1850. 12 mo. pp. 412.

THE last great poem of the age! We have little fear that the time will ever come when Smelfungus Redivivus need throw down his pen in despair, declaring that critics must cease to criticise because authors had ceased to write. The present century properly claims the maternity of Reviews, and statistics of the present time would show that it has been increasingly prolific; and yet, if Reviews have any mission to discharge at all, they are scarcely sufficient for the labor ready prepared to their hands. Notwithstanding the practical business character of the present age, it is emphatically an age of authorship; and, while the great facilities and inducements which it affords may elicit much that is worthless and trashy, we cannot help thinking that it gives birth to more golden thought than any preceding one, and that in its womb there are mighty travailings of spirit, the offspring of which a future age will recognise and cherish. There are, doubtless, great eras in the world's history and in national history, when, in correspondence with the outward phase of the age,

VOL. III.—NO. V. 26*

the seeds of genius are scattered with a more lavish hand, and the growth of thought is more healthful and luxuriant. And then again there are eras which are barren of mind as well as of events. But these eras only unveil themselves in their true character to succeeding generations; and often in the midst of a rich and blooming age we find men bewailing its barrenness.

And with regard to poetry, we see no good reason, if we will but open our eyes, to be in despair of our own age. There too there is a great redundancy and overgrowth, but amidst it all we think there is much that is touched with the enkindling Promethean spark. Just think of the poets that have flourished within living memory:—Goethe and Schiller and Byron and Coleridge and Scott and Wordsworth and Campbell and Moore and a host of others,—and are we not ashamed to complain of the barrenness of the age? It is an old story that the ancients have gone over the field of thought; and that in poetry Homer and Dante and Shakspeare and Milton have left nothing for moderns to do but imitate and transform. But who did not suppose at one time that Euclid and Archimedes had left nothing for Newton or Leibnitz to do; or that Newton and Leibnitz and Kepler had left nothing for Leverrier and Kirkwood? Who did not think when steam was discovered that the secrets of nature were exhausted? And are we not now prone to look upon the telegraph as the last possible invention? Poetry springs from an abiding substratum of our nature, and although historical and social circumstances may very much modify the products of this substratum, they cannot wholly suppress them. As long as humanity continues to live and think and feel, poetry will find a tongue, though at one time it may herald a victory, at another echo the wail of a weary spirit returning from its forlorn flight after the ineffable and infinite, and at another utter the rapt aspirations of christian hope.

What historical and social circumstances are the most favorable to the development of the *highest form* of poetry, is a question which cannot be settled until men come to agree in their definitions of poetry itself. That the truest poetry should flourish in a barbarous and uncultivated soil, were an anomaly which we could not possibly reconcile with our conceptions of poetry and history. The highest state of civilization will produce vastly inferior poetry of the same *kind* with that of a barbarous age, should it attempt to produce it; but its own poetry will be as much superior in kind. During the growth of any particular form of civilization, there are certain great *stages* through which the human mind passes; each stage characterised by a peculiar

type of thought, taste and feeling. These give birth to certain products, which are only understood and appreciated when permitted to bloom upon their own soil. When forced from this they become drooping exotics. The products of each age are suited to its exigencies, and the best under the circumstances. It would be impossible to repeat now even the best characteristics of the civilization of mediæval Europe. Chivalry, for instance, is a green spot upon the history of society in the Middle Ages, yet it would be incongruous, if it were not impossible, to call it forth now. What a figure would the gallant knight-errant make on an English thoroughfare or an American turnpike! What rare sport for curious and impudent boys! In these different stages of civilization, poetry must necessarily assume different types; for poetry, by its very nature sympathises deeply with the human life amid which it blooms. It takes its coloring from the actual joys and sorrows, pleasures and pains, hopes and fears of existing humanity. Poetry, moreover, is always in a great degree the product of the imagination. This too changes its type and direction, with the transition from one stage of society to another. Just so is it in the history of the single individual. It is a common remark, that in youth the imagination is strongest, and declines as the judgment matures. We are disposed to think it a mistake. In manhood we cease to feel the power of those lower workings of the imagination, which in youth clothed for us the Adventures of Lemuel Gulliver, Robinson Crusoe or the Pilgrim's Progress, with all the soberness of literal reality. But the imagination has not decayed. It has risen to a higher sphere, and is conversant with purer, loftier more spiritual images. It wings through the empyrean regions of the ideal, with scarcely a sensible form to bear up its flight. Now apply this to poetry as it comes before us as the product of different stages of civilization. In a semi-barbarous age the imagination is conversant with lower forms, drawn principally from nature and man's immediate relations, and, in analogy with the law as exhibited in the individual, its pictures are intensely vivid. It grasps with a firmer hold and clings with a childlike faith. But as society advances the field of perception widens, the sphere of ideas becomes enlarged, and the imagination rises to higher forms and more pure and spiritual creations; grasped with less tenacity and exhibited less tangibly, simply because more ethereal. In evidence of this it were only necessary to compare the types of imagination as displayed successively in the old heroic poets of Germany, in the mediæval bards of chivalry, in Dante; in Chaucer, in Spenser, in Shakespeare, in Milton and, we might

add without presumption, in "*Festus*;" for the dizzy flights of imagination form the most remarkable feature of the book.

It is an old complaint that a true poet is not appreciated in his own times, and doubtless there is much ground for it. This seems an untoward fact in view of the position we have taken. If the true poet embodies the human thought and feeling among which he breathes, why does not each age recognise and cherish its legitimate offspring? To this a double answer may be given: first, as society is progressive and its poetry is its highest product, in a certain sense,—its loftiest and most spiritual aspiration,—it is greatly in advance of the common mind, and while it gathers up and embodies its feeling and sympathies, it yet possesses an element which raises it above the appreciation of the masses. The true poet of an age is not only, to a large extent, its historian but is emphatically its *vates*, its *seer*, who stands upon the verge of its horizon, and looks into the region beyond. Secondly, an age never comes to a clear consciousness of itself, of its wants, and of its vocation. Hence the usual fate of reformers, obloquy and persecution. An age hardly ever recognises its distinguishing peculiarities. The eye cannot see itself. We are creatures of the past. The present to us always takes much of its coloring from the memories of the past. We draw from thence our standards of judgment and taste, and we are not prepared to appreciate anything which bears the distinctive characteristics of the present; which is at the same time to be powerfully available for the future. Add to this the fact that we are often the dupes of the past. Distance in time as well as in space, "lends enchantment to the view." The characters of history loom up before us in wonderful proportions like supposed giants in a foggy night, while our contemporaries are passed by as the men and women of every day life. Without meaning to derogate in the least from the true merit of the great poets of antiquity, we cannot help thinking that we practise upon ourselves a very subtle delusion, when we compare them with those of our own times. It requires an immense effort to see each in their just proportions. Familiarity aids this delusion. Here a law of our nature comes into play. The peasant of the Alpine valleys rarely stops to wonder at the huge piles which surround him. It is philosophy as well as scripture, that "a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and among his own kin."

Believing, as the course of our remarks thus far will show, that poetry is not dead,—that it will never die—we are not surprised to light upon such a poem as the one before us, the pro-

duct of this so-called mechanical age. And, although we will have many exceptions to record against it, we will endeavor to give such an account of it, and to exhibit so much of it as shall induce our readers who love poetry to purchase it for themselves. It might be presumptuous to pronounce definitely upon its absolute merit. We leave this for coming generations. We leave with them also to discover whether it possesses a vaticinative significance, as indicative of a religious tendency of the present age, whether for weal or for woe. That it possesses many elements of a great poem, and that its type of thought, feeling and imagination, is legitimate to the present age, we firmly believe.

The Dedication is dated 1838, which we presume was the date of its first publication in England. It was first published in this country in 1844, and we believe its circulation, both in England and in this country, has been limited.

Before proceeding farther we beg leave to introduce some notices of "Festus" by distinguished Englishmen and English periodicals. Here is one from the *Britannia* :

"Sure we are that Festus will be read, admired and lauded, as one among the most striking, original and powerful productions of the age. Our impression, after a careful and attentive perusal of it, is, that a new poet, and a great poet, is again among us."

Listen to *James Montgomery*, the author of the *Pelican Island*:

"There is a great exuberance of thought and imagery throughout this work, and a profuse expenditure of both, fearless of exhaustion of the author's stores. One feels as if he had, 'eaten the insane root that takes the reason prisoner' in many passages; or of 'the tree of knowledge of good and evil,' with strange elevations of spirit, and stranger misgivings, alternately glowing and shivering through the bosom."

A short, though pithy one from *Mrs. S. C. Hall*:

"There is matter enough in it to float a hundred volumes of the usual prose poetry. It contains some of the most wonderful things I ever read."

We confess we were somewhat startled by reading these and similar notices, and we commenced reading the book in good earnest; and in all candor we must say that "the half was not told us." Nevertheless we will find it necessary to qualify these wholesale praises, for they evidently were not meant to disclose the whole truth. We shall endeavor so to shade our eyes from

the dazzling splendor of "Festus," as to be able to scan its very serious deformities.

The book is pre-eminently the product of the religious spirit. That its religion is christianity,—or rather that it possesses enough of christianity to save it from being merely deistical—we would fain hope. But of this more hereafter. The author seems to be one of those burning, impassioned spirits, with great temptations and greater aspirations, whom nothing earthly can satisfy, who are intensely alive to their relations to God and to the future, and who long for something better and more enduring. The following passage in the mouth of Festus, is, as we shall learn presently, a life-picture of the author himself.

"Come, let us to the hills! where none but God
Can overlook us; for I hate to breathe
The breaths and think the thoughts of other men.
In close and clouded cities, where the sky
Frowns like an angry Father mournfully.
I love the hills and I love loneliness.
And Oh! I love the woods, those natural fanes
Whose very air is holy; and we breathe
Of God; for he doth come in special place,
And, while we worship, He is there for us!"—p. 100.

There is perhaps in his nature a slight tinge of misanthropy, which, struggling as it ever is with a world-embracing love and deep heart-yearnings, takes a peculiar form, and renders his character often apparently contradictory. He hates men for their follies and stupidities, but his heart yearns towards them when he remembers they are made in the image of God.

The depth of the author's own religious sensibilities gives him a sort of holy daring, which in many minds will expose him to the charge of irreverence. He uses the name of God with the utmost familiarity. He introduces as speakers not only angels, saints and devils, but God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He lays his scenes in the deepest arcana of the spirit world. He confronts, unabashed, the dazzling splendor of the eternal throne, and "seems at home, where angels bashful look."

We cannot think this daring arises, as in the case of Byron, from any irreverence in feeling, but from the deep, religious earnestness of the author's nature. We would not judge harshly of such spirits. Indeed we know not that, on this point, others have a right to judge at all. "The Lord looketh upon the heart." Let the author speak for himself:

"He used

The name of God as spirits use it, barely,
Yet surely more sublime in nakedness,
Statuelike, than in a whole tongue of dress.
Thou knowest, God! that to the full of worship
All things are worship-full; and Thy great name
In all its awful brevity hath nought
Unholy breeding in it, but doth bless
Rather the tongue that utters it; for me
I ask no higher office than to fling
My spirit at Thy feet, and cry Thy name
God! through eternity."—pp. 262-263.

Charges of irreverence have been made, and hence, to the second English edition from which the one before us is taken, the author has prefixed a *Proem* unfolding the general purpose of the work, and endeavoring to relieve it from these aspersions. Whether he has succeeded, or whether the charge *can be* palliated in the reader's mind, we leave him to judge from a specimen or two from the book itself. Here is the Dedication, addressed to none other than the Supreme God:

"My Father! unto thee to whom I owe
All that I am, all that I have and can;
Who madest me in thyself the sum of man
In all his generous aims and powers to know,
These first fruits bring I; nor do thou forego
Marking when I the boyish feat began,
Which numbers now near three years from its plan,
Not twenty summers had imbrowned my brow.
Life is at blood-heat every page doth prove.
Bear with it. Nature means Necessity.
If here be aught which thou canst love, it springs
Out of the hope that I may earn that love
More unto me than immortality;
Or to have strung my harp with golden strings."

Here is the opening of the Poem:

"SCENE—Heaven.

GOD.

Eternity has snowed its years upon them;
And the white winter of their age is come,
The World and all its worlds; and all shall end.
Seraphim. God! God! God!
As flames in skies

We burn and rise
 And lose ourselves in Thee !
 Years on years !
 And nought appears
 Save God to be.
 God ! God ! God !
 * * * * *

Cherubim. As sun and star,
 How high or far,
 Shew but a boundless sky ;
 So creature mind
 Is all confined
 To shew Thee, God, most High !
 * * * * *

Seraphim and Cherubim. God ! God ! God !
 Thou fill'st our eyes
 As were the skies
 One burning, boundless sun !
 While creature mind,
 In path confined,
 Passeth a spot thereon.
 God ! God ! God !"

One other extract on this point :

" *Lucifer.* (*To Angel of Earth.*) Knowest thou not
 God's son to be the brother and the friend
 Of spirit everywhere ? Or hath thy soul
 Been bound for ever to thy foolish world ?

Angel. Star unto star speaks light, and world to world
 Repeats the password of the universe
 To God ; the name of Christ—the one great word
 Well worth all languages in earth or Heaven.

Son of God. Think not I lived and died for thine alone,
 And that no other sphere hath hailed me Christ.
 My life is ever suffering for love.
 In judging and redeeming worlds is spent
 Mine everlasting being.

Lucifer. Earth he next
 Will judge ; for so saith God.

Angel of Earth. Be it not, Lord !
 Thou art a God of goodness and of love ;
 He is the evil of the universe,
 And loveth not the earth, Thy Son, nor Thee.
 Thou knowest best."—pp. 25-26.

This may not be irreverence, but it certainly looks like daring

familiarity. If there is irreverence it is in the conception and execution of such a poem.

But the reader will be impatient to have some account of the plan and purport of the book. This we feel to be no easy task ; and we promise that it will be, at best, but very imperfectly done.

We may say, summarily, that the general drift of the Poem is to unfold the philosophy of creation and redemption,—according to the author's conception of it,—including the ministry of evil ; and descending to many of the details of human life :—the loves, hopes, joys, sorrows, temptations, sufferings, sins, of living men and women. As the author himself says of it, “it has a plan, but no plot. Life hath none.” It is perhaps more like tragedy than any other of the distinctive forms of poetry ; yet it is not a tragedy, nor a comedy, nor a lyric, nor an epic, nor anything else but simply a poem. It is tragical, comic, lyrical, epic, all together. It is simply a succession of scenes, following each other without any special dramatic connection, yet all tending to one great end, and laid in every conceivable, and in many an inconceivable place, in the universe. It is a series of panoramic views, unveiling to us the doings in Heaven, earth and hell, and winding up with the final consummation of all things. Yet it enters deeply, as we said, into human life ; indeed its great burden is the history of a single soul. We are told in the Poem that “its sole end points to God the Father's glory,” and unfolds how,

“He loves to order a chance soul
Chosen out of the world, from first to last.
And all along it is the heart of man
Emblemed, created and creative mind.
It is a statued mind and naked heart
Which is struck out.”—p. 8.

Of the Hero of the Poem, he says :

“The mortal is the model of all men ;
The foibles, follies, trials, sufferings—
And manifest and manifold are they—
Of a young, hot, unworld-schooled heart that has
Had its own way in life, and wherein all
May see some likeness of their own,—'tis these
Attract, unite, and, sunlike, concentrate
The ever-moving system of our feelings.
The hero is the world-man, in whose heart
One passion stands for all, the most indulged.
The scenes wherein he plays his part are life,

A sphere whose centre is co-heavenly
With its divine original and end."—pp. 9-10.

This hero is Festus; a youth of dazzling gifts and impassioned nature,—the rare child of genius,

"his heart all-lit with love,
Like to the rolling sea with living light;—
Hopeful and generous and earnest; rich
In commune with high spirits, loving truth
And wisdom for their own divinest selves:
Tracking the deeds of the world's glory, or
Conning the words of wisdom, Heaven-inspired,
As on the soul, in pure effectual ray,
The bright, transparent atoms, thought by thought,
Fall fixed for evermore."—p. 22.

One might say of him as Aubrey de Vere said of Coleridge:

"And mighty voices from afar came to him;
Converse of trumpets held by cloudy forms,
And speech of choral storms.
Spirits of night and moonlight bent to woo him—"

Such is the hero of the poem, and this hero, as we are afterwards unequivocally given to understand, is Philip James Bailey himself. The poem is

"The life-writ of a heart,
Whose firmest prop and highest meaning was
The hope of serving God as poet-priest."—p. 8.

Here then is a remarkable characteristic of the book. There have been other poets, who have unconsciously given the tinge of their personal character to their writings. The character of Byron gleams through all his poetry. You see it in the background like a haunting ghost, which will not away at your bidding; and it so happens that the character of Byron is such as the fewest can love, and his poetry is cursed by its presence. But here the personal character of the author does not merely gleam unconsciously through the surface, but is openly and deliberately portrayed at full length. It forms the staple of the book. There is a remarkable scene commencing on page 241, between *Festus*, *Helen*, and a *Student*, in which Festus describes to the Student a friend whom he once knew; some scraps of which description we will give:

"*Festus*. He had no times of study and no place;
All places and all times to him were one.

His soul was like the wind-harp, which he loved,
 And sounded only when the spirit blew.
 Sometime in feasts and follies, for he went
 Life-like through all things; and his thoughts then rose
 Like sparkles in the bright wine, brighter still.
 Sometimes in dreams, and then the shining words
 Would wake him in the dark before his face.
 All things talked thoughts to him. The sea went mad,
 And the wind whined as 't were in pain, to shew
 Each one his meaning; and the awful sun
 Thundered his thoughts into him; and at night
 The stars would whisper theirs, the moon, sigh hers."—p. 254.

Again:

"So he applied him to all themes that came;
 Loving the most to breast the rapid deeps
 Where others had been drowned, and heeding nought,
 Where danger might not fill the place of fame.
 And 'mid the magic circle of those sounds,
 His lyre rayed out, spell-bound himself he stood,
 Like a stilled storm. It is no task for suns
 To shine. He knew himself a bard ordained,
 More than inspired, of God; inspirited:—
 Making himself like an electric rod
 A lure for lightning-feelings."—p. 261.

He goes on to describe a poem which his friend wrote and the description gives us the book before us in miniature; and, as if all his powers were concentrated upon the picture, like rays of the sun converging to the focal point, it glows and burns with an unearthly brightness. After the description the scene closes thus:

"*Student.* Say, did thy friend
 Write aught beside the work thou tell'st of?
Festus. Nothing.
 After that, like the burning peak, he fell
 Into himself, and was missing ever after.
Student. If not a secret, pray who was he?
Festus. L"—p. 289.

To the reader of "*Festus*" this is a startling avowal. It strikes us as a daring and hazardous experiment. When we remember the character of *Festus* as it towers and flames before us in the former part of the book, we cannot help asking ourselves, "is it possible the author intends that as his own portrait?" But the avowal is in character with the general tone

and spirit of the book. It is characterised by daring or even recklessness. The truth is the poem is written on a hazardous plan; on a plan on which none but a great genius could escape humiliating failure. We are not sure that the author has not slightly over estimated his powers. But this appears only in some minor scenes, which hold the same place relatively to the entire work, which the feat of Milton's angels in hurling mountains holds to the *Paradise Lost*. It is the "naked heart" of the author which is struck out in the Poem. Is it the curse or the salvation of it? This will be according as it is hated or loved. For our own part, when we had reached the end of the book, notwithstanding the thrill of pleasure it left, we had so often alternately loved and despised the character we had been studying, that we found it difficult to balance accounts. We must proceed with the plan of the Poem.

The first scene it will be remembered, is laid in Heaven, and it will be seen that it much resembles the opening of that old, inspired epic, the book of Job. After the song of Cherubim and Seraphim, quoted above, *Lucifer* speaks, and is answered:

"God.

What wouldst thou, Lucifer?

Lucifer.

There is a youth

Among the sons of men I fain would have

Given up wholly to me.

God.

He is thine,

To tempt.

Lucifer. I thank Thee, Lord!

God.

Upon his soul

Thou hast no power. All souls are mine for aye.

And I do give thee leave to this that he

May know my love is more than all his sin,

And prove unto himself that nought but God

Can satisfy the soul He maketh great.

Lucifer.

* * * *

In him of whom I ask, I seek once more

To tempt the living world, and then depart.

[Heaven,

The Holy Ghost. And I will follow him to the ends of

That though he plunge his soul in sin like a sword

In water, it shall nowise cling to him.

He is of Heaven. All things are known in Heaven,

Ere aimed at upon earth. The child is chosen."—pp. 20, 21.

This is the key to the whole Poem. The rest is the history

of the temptations and soul-struggles of the chosen one, often running through long, labyrinthine windings, where the closest attention is required to retain the clue.

Moreover, Festus is the last man :

" God.

The earth whereon
He dwells, this grain selected from the sands
Of life, dies with him.

Lucifer. God ! I go to do
Thy will."—p. 24.

The first scene is thus an index to the book. In the next the temptation begins. Festus is alone, amid a landscape of wood and water, at sunset, soliloquising upon himself and the world around him. He chafes and frets, like a caged eagle, under the restraints of his limited being, and feels the wish for a higher, wider sphere, in which to launch his spirit-wing,

" across the mind
Rush, like a rocket tearing up the sky."

He longs for boundless power and omnipotence of knowledge.

" Mind must subdue. To conquer is its life.
Why mad'st Thou not one spirit, like the sun,
To king the world ? And oh ! might I have been
That sun-mind ; how I would have warmed the world
To love and worship and bright life !" —p. 31.

At this moment *Lucifer* appears, and by fiendishly tempering his address with scoffs, ridicule and promises, he lures the soul with bright visions of that for which it longed. Festus is overcome, yields himself a captive, and promises to accompany his tempter ; but asks a breathing time until midnight. The next scene is at midnight, amid wood and water. The dialogue and the temptation continue. The re-actings of Festus' better nature are lulled for the time. His eager spirit catches at the bait of knowledge and power. He is ready, he bids farewell to the loved scenes of his youth, and departs with the fiend. This scene contains some passages of great power and pathos. Nothing can exceed the impassioned tenderness of Festus' recital of his early love of the dead Angela. And yet there is something about it which makes one shrink. She died of grief at his desertion, as we learn afterwards, and his repentance, though full of pangs, is too much pervaded by the reckless spirit, which casts itself and all its sins upon the bosom of destiny.

Festus and *Lucifer* next appear upon a mountain at sunrise, and hold high and burning discourse upon nature, creation, sin, heaven, hell, time and eternity. *Lucifer* pours oil upon the glowing aspirations of the youth, until they blaze and rage with an unhallowed flame. Nothing could be more finely attempered than is the address of the fiend to the ardent spirit of *Festus*. He is enraptured with his guide :

"Thou thundercloud of spirits, darkning
The skies and wrecking earth ! Could I hate men
How I should joy with thee, even as an eagle,
Nigh famished, in the fellowship of storms ;
But I still love them."—p. 58.

He is still unsatisfied. He demands a spirit of purest essence, an "ethereal slave," to be with him, and obey him, and unfold to him the deepest secrets of the elements,—such a spirit as he has often seen "in the divine insanity of dreams." *Lucifer* bids him call to the elements to yield him one. He invokes the "green, dewy earth :

"Speak to me !
I am thy son. Canst thou not now, as once,
Bring forth some being dearer, liker to thee
Than is my race,—Titan or tiny fay,
Stream-nymph or wood-nymph ?
* * *

Lucifer. More's
The pity. Call elsewhere ! Old Earth is hard
Of hearing, maybe.

Festus. I beseech thee, Sea !
Tossing thy wavy locks in sparkling play,
Like to a child awakening with the light
To laughter. Canst not thou dis gulph for me,
From thy deep bosom, deep as Heaven is high,
Of all thy sea-gods one, or sea-maids ?

Lucifer. None !"—pp. 61-62.

He turns to the fire slumbering like a stern warrior in his rocky fort, and demands a "flaming imp or messenger, of empyrean element." Failed, he addresses to the air a long invocation which we would like to quote did space permit, it closes thus :

"Monarch of all the elements ! hast thou
No soft Eolian sylph, with sightless wing,
To spare a mortal for an hour !

Lucifer.

Peace, peace!

All nature knows that I am with thee here,
 And that thou need'st no minor minister.
 To thee I personate the world—its powers,
 Beliefs, and doubts and practices.

Festus.

Are all

Mine invocations fruitless, then?

Lucifer.

They are.

Let us enjoy the world!"—p. 64.

Here is the bait; and the mind of Festus, chagrined by his fruitless longings, is prepared to sieze it.

The next is a scene of pure but burning love, between Festus and Clara. Festus talks darkly sometimes, and Clara points him to God and Heaven. It is a scene which would leave gentle, holy thoughts behind it, did not the spectral remembrance of Angela haunt the mind. Festus and Lucifer again meet "anywhere." The youth is mortified and moody, and a stormy quarrel and separation follow. Again they meet, as though nothing had happened, at noon, in the market-place of a country town. The Devil preaches a characteristic sermon to the crowd, from the steps of the old grey market-cross. He tells them plain truths, without mincing, in sufficiently diabolical style, and the crowd put him down as a ranter. A prayer by Festus, which we read with much pain, and a hymn by the Devil, close the exercises of the occasion. We think this scene will at least awaken the curiosity of the reader.

We cannot pass by the next scene without notice. It is a ride around the world, which Lucifer and Festus take upon the twin steeds Ruin and Darkness. We notice it, not only as exhibiting a phase of the temptation, but also as evincing the author's power of versification, which seldom, in the other parts of the book, appears to much advantage. Here the flow of the verse and the harmony of the rhyme are often perfectly enchanting. We seem to be borne along as merrily and wildly as the gallant horsemen themselves.

"SCENE—*The Surface.*

Lucifer and Festus.

Lucifer. Wilt ride?*Festus.*

I'll have an hour's ride.

Lucifer. Be mine the steeds! be me the guide!

Come hither, come hither,

My brave black steed!

And thou, too, his fellow,

Hither with speed!
 Though not so fleet
 As the steeds of Death,
 Your feet are as sure,
 Ye have longer breath.
 Ye have drawn the world
 Without wind or bait,
 Six thousand years,
 And it waxeth late;
 So take me this once,
 And again to my home,
 And rest ye and feast ye.
 They come, they come."—p. 101.

Safely mounted they dash away.

"*Festus.* Hurrah! hurrah!
 The noblest pace the world e'er saw.
 I swear by Heaven we'll beat the sun,
 In the longest heat that ever was run;
 If we keep it up as we have begun."

They sweep over the world, visiting its every land, and making passing comments as they go. Festus is bewildered with delight.

"*Festus.* I swear by every atom which exists,
 I better love this reckless ride
 O'er hill and forest, lake and river wide;
 O'er sunlit plain and through the mountain mists,
 Than aught which thou hast given beside."—p. 104.

From above the shore of Hindostan, they plunge upon the wave, and find their steeds expert swimmers.

"*Festus.* Away, away upon the whitening tide.
 Like lover hastening to embrace his bride,
 We hurry faster than the foam we ride.
 Dashing aside the waves which round us cling,
 With strength like that which lifts an eagle's wing
 Where the stars dazzle and the angels sing.

Lucifer. We scatter the spray,
 And break through the billows,
 As the wind makes way
 Through the leaves of the willows!"—p. 106.

They think of the gems and untold beauties of the coral-lined bottom of the deep.

"*Lucifer.* Hold hard, and follow me!
Well, now we have travelled upon the waves,
Wilt travel a time beneath?
And visit the sea-born in their caves;
And look on the rainbow-tinted wreath
Of weeds, beset with pearls, wherewith
The mermaid binds her long green hair,
Or rouse the sea-snake from his lair?

Festus. Ay, ay! down let us dive!"—p. 108.

Throughout the scene are scattered some passages of great lyrical beauty. Take the following:—

"Oh! happy, if at last I lie
Within some pebbled and coral cave;
While over head the booming surge
And moaning billow shall chaunt my dirge;
And the storm-blast, as it sweepeth by,
Shall, answering, howl to the mermaid's sigh,
And the nightwind's mournful minstrelsy,
Their requiem over my grave."—p. 110.

The ride finished, Festus avows:—

"I am bound to thee for ever
By the pleasure of this day;
Henceforth we will never sever;
Come what come may!"—p. 112.

But we cannot follow the thread of the play in detail as it winds through the consecutive scenes. Festus follows his infernal guide through the central fire-crypts of the world; through the regions of the air and boundless space; through sun and planets, in one of which he meets the spirit of Angela; they forgive the past, and pledge their spirit-love with burning vows; through Heaven and hell: anywhere and everywhere. From what he has learned of the book, the reader may well judge that some of these scenes make one tremble for the daring genius which attempted them: and he may well imagine also that in some of them failure was inevitable. In all, the insatiate desires of the youth for knowledge and power are fanned and mocked; and everywhere his better nature reacts, and he longs only for God and a sense of his love. Often the scenes descend to earth and present us pictures of various hues. Festus is tempted with fashion, with wine, with love and beauty; and in all he yields and repents. His "guilt and glory lay in love,"—and more guilt than glory to our mind. We have frequent scenes

beneath the star of eve, and in twined bowers, in which figure successively, besides the ethereal Angela, as the loves of his heart, Clara, Helen, Marian and Elissa. His love to these is full of tender and passionate earnestness. All is pure and taintless as the dream of a seraph. And yet each one is in turn forsaken,—not betrayed but deserted—and their love reserved for the heavenly state. Let us pause a moment over the history of Elissa, and wonder at the imagination which conceived it; while we may detest the heart which gleams through it all. Lucifer, it seems, had been sporting among the fair in the shape of a handsome gallant, and we are introduced to a love scene, in a garden and bower by the sea, between him and his Elissa. He talks love as passionately as ever did human wight, sings to her of Lucifer the star, and throws out dark double meanings which make one shudder. Festus enters; is introduced as a friend; Lucifer is called away and confides the maiden to the care of the youth; saying, aside:

“Why, hell would laugh to learn I had been in love!”

In a following scene we have Festus and Elissa struggling with involuntary love, and finally yielding the avowal that each can love no other. Lucifer is led in by a servant, as a singer, and sings a song of warning; at last reveals himself, and departs, threatening that worse shall ensue. Again we have Elissa alone, in a garden and bower by the sea, apostrophising to the coming Festus. Lucifer enters, and in a tone of refined and triumphant malignity, tells her he is come to bid her die. She feels the pulse of life ebbing; Festus enters; Elissa dies; Lucifer is scouted with abhorrence, but goes with the significant question: “Who seeks the other first?”

Then comes the last lure—that of power, and it is taken.

“*Lucifer.* I proffer now the power which thou dost long
Say but the word, and thou shalt press a throne [for.
But less than mine—the scarcely less than God’s;—
A throne, at which earth’s puny potentates
May sue for slavedoms—and be satisfied.

Festus. I have had enough of the infinities:
I am moderate now. I will have the throne of earth.

Lucifer. Thou shalt. Yet, mind!—with that, the world

Festus. I can survive. [must end.

Lucifer. Nay, die with it must thou.”—p. 370.

The youth recoils for a moment, but again grasps it. He is weary of life—sick of the world and men, and feels that death

will be some relief at all risks. At the same time are mingled longings to return to the bosom of God, and bathe in the pure effulgence of heavenly existence. The angels descend to talk with him of his mighty destiny. His guardian angel nerves him for the "miracle of death." Again we have a gathering of kings and people, and Festus as a monarch speaks from his throne. Lucifer is his minister of state, and promulgates his laws for universal obedience. But the catastrophe comes, as threatened in the first scene.

Festus. Hark! thou fiend! dost hear?

Lucifer. Ay! it is the death groan of the sons of men—
Thy subjects—King!

Festus. Why hadst thou this so soon?

Lucifer. It is God who brings it all about—not I.

Festus. All around me die. The earth is one great death-bed.

Clara. Oh! save me, Festus! I have fled to thee,
Through all the countless nations of yon dead—
For well I knew it was thou who sattest there,
To die with thee, if that thou art not Death:
And, if thou wert, I would not shrink from thee.
I am thine own, own Clara!"—pp. 383-384.

She rests in his arms, but soon sinks and dies in the last "kiss of life and death." The scene closes with the death of Festus.

The scenes which follow wind up the plan both of the book and the universe; and in a theological view are painfully startling. Lucifer is confined to Hades, to await God's judgment. Saints, angels and the graces, walk the millennial earth. In Hades, an Arch-angel, Festus, Death, Lucifer and the man-made Gods of antiquity, Jove, Brahm, Boodh and Odin, hold mysterious converse on their state, and feel a dim presentiment of their coming redemption. In the regions of the air, the great battle between "Michael and his angels and the Devil and his angels," is fought, and the hosts of hell vanquished. At Judgment, the nations of the earth are summoned, a universal amnesty proclaimed, and all men saved, except Festus. His judgment is reserved for the Heaven of Heavens. There in the presence of the Recording Angel, Angels and Lucifer, the Son of God proclaims him saved, and Festus pours out his soul in boundless gratitude. Lucifer is about taking his leave, wishing for death, but is arrested by the voice of God, who tells him his mission is accomplished, the necessity of evil is past, he too is

redeemed by the blood of Christ, and his services shall be rewarded.

"Take, Lucifer, thy place. This day art thou
Redeemed to archangelic state. Bright child
Of morning, once again thou shinnest fair
O'er all the starry ornaments of light."—p. 410.

With him are restored all the fallen angels and join in the anthem of praise.

"SON OF GOD.

All God hath made are saved. Heaven is complete.

Guardian Angel. Hither with me!

Festus. But where are those I love?

Angel. Yon happy troop!

Festus. Ah! blest ones, come to me!

Loves of my heart, on earth; and soul in Heaven!

Are ye all here, too, with me?

All.

All!

Festus. It is Heaven."—p. 410.

We leave it an open question, whether this is a sufficient atonement for faithless love upon earth.

We are near the end of the book but its deouement has not yet transpired. All souls, angelic, human and infernal, are re-absorbed into the primal Deity and God is all and alone!

"THE HOLY GHOST.

Time there hath been when only God was all:

And it shall be again. The hour is named,

When seraph, cherub, angel, saint, man, fiend,

Made pure, and unbelievably uplift

Above their present state—drawn up to God—

Like dew into the air—shall be all Heaven;

And all souls shall be in God, and shall be God.

And nothing but God, be.

SON OF GOD.

Let all be God's.

GOD.

World without end, and I am God alone;

The Aye, the Infinite, the Whole, the One.

I only was—nor matter else, nor mind,

The self-contained Perfection unconfined.

I only am—in might and mercy one;

I live in all things and am closed in none.

I only shall be—when the worlds have done,

My boundless Being will be but begun."—pp. 411-412.

We feel that we have been traveling over strange ground ; and before the reader's fervor subsides we will give him the author's parting salutation.

" L'ENVOI.

Read this, world ! He who writes is dead to thee,
But still lives in these leaves. He spake inspired :
Night and day, thought came unhelped, undesired,
Like blood to his heart. The course of study he
Went through was of the soul-rack. The degree
He took was high : it was wise wretchedness.
He suffered perfectly, and gained no less
A prize than, in his own torn heart, to see
A few bright seeds : he sowed them—hoped them truth.
The autumn of that seed is in these pages.
God was with him, and bade old Time, to the youth,
Unclench his heart, and teach the book of ages.
Peace to thee, world !—farewell ! May God the Power,
And God the Love,—and God the Grace, be ours !"

Is it madness or poetic inspiration ? Really we cannot tell. It may be a mixture of both.

Our object has been to give the reader, who has not happened upon the book, an idea of it. Hence we have dealt largely in quotation, feeling assured that no representation of ours could suffice so well. But we asseverate that, in keeping close to the plan, we have given but a few gems of the rich mine of thought and imagery which glittered before us. We passed by several episodes, and lyrics, of great beauty, which nothing but want of space prevented us from transcribing.

From the specimens we have given the reader will have easily perceived the general characteristics of the author's poetry. It is of the lofty, imaginative, impassioned character. Sometimes it rises to foaming Pythic furor. In the midst of this there is much weakness. The truth is his genius moves only by impulse, and although it often enables him to soar nobly, yet when the *afflatus* is off he sinks low. The want of mature mental training is manifest. These faults, however, may be accounted for by the fact, that the book was written soon after the author had left his teens. If he meant it as the great and only work of his life, we are sorry he did not postpone the final execution of it at least ten years. It was written in that transition stage in the development of such a spirit, when it is dangerous to write anything for the world. Much of it reminds us of Byron, with the additional element of a more earnest, religious spirit. This is all that saves the book from the sulphurous misanthropy of

Manfred. In point of imagination, not only as exhibited in single passages, but in the whole conception of the book, we know of nothing among modern productions—passing by Milton whose type of imagination is very different—with which to compare it. It approaches the gorgeous theological fables of the Oriental Basilides or Valentine. The aspirations of *Festus* often remind us of *Sophia*, winging her way from the regions of matter, towards the unfathomable abyss of the primal Essence, and held back by *Horus* the impersonated time-spirit, the guardian of the boundary between finite knowledge and the infinite. We meet with much that is presumptuous and extravagant;—nay even preposterous. Vaulting ambition always overleaps itself. But these are the faults of a great genius.

The author's cast of imagination makes it difficult for him to put off his distinctive character. He would not make a successful dramatist. This is shown in his female characters. True, they always talk purely, sometimes sweetly, and often naturally. But they are perpetually betrayed into long speeches, in which we hear only the lofty tone and glowing rhapsodies of *Festus* himself. The versification we cannot examine minutely. It is often smooth and harmonious; and of great rhythmical beauty; but oftener it is rough and lumbering,—full of excrescences and abnormalities. Sometimes there seems to be a studied contempt of artistic effort. But it is in character with the author and the poem.

But what shall we say of the religion of the book,—or rather its theology? We have said it is the product of the religious spirit. This is evident on every page. But so were the reveries of *Montanus*, and the ravings of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit. So were the speculations of *Manes* and the *Gnostics*. So were the systems of *Pelagius* and *Socinus*. The reader will have observed, that the author assumes an air that looks very much like fanaticism. To say that,

“He knew himself a bard ordained,
More than inspired of God, inspirited.”

is certainly pretty bold. We are aware of the almost unbounded franchise which poetry claims and requires, and this alone prevents us from assigning his spiritual consanguinity to the same class with *Menander*, *Mark Stubner* and *Joe Smith*. In the *Proem*, we are told that the religion of the book is

“Followed out from the book God writ of old;”

and much of it doubtless is. The fundamental doctrines of the

Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement are recognised. But there is much besides which evangelical Christianity pronounces to be not found in the "book God writ of old."

In the first place, the whole book is deeply *pantheistic*. Pantheism might be called the natural religion of poetry. It seems to be indigenous to its soil. There is something so beautiful in it, something so fascinating to the imagination, something so congenial to the religious spirit which genius has fired, that it has ever been the Scylla by which poetry has been endangered, when the charybdis of scoffing scepticism had no power to draw it. Religious genius is never safe, except when gazing full-faced, and with a teachable spirit, upon the shining orb of revealed truth. Its pantheistic tendency has been clearly seen from the denouement of the book, which we have given. We will cite a few passages from the body of the Poem :

"But since now earth is as a crumb of Heaven,
And time an atom of eternity,
Neither depends upon the other, both
One essence being emanant from God,
Whose flowings forth are aye and infinite,
And radiant as the rivers of the skies."—p. 340.

Again :

"A world
Is but, perhaps, a sense of God's, by which
He may explain His nature, and receive
Fit pleasure. But the hour is hard at hand,
When Time's grey wing shall winnow all away,
The atoms of the earth, the stars of Heaven ;
When the created and Creator mind
Shall know each other, worlds and bodies both
Put off for aye."—p. 377.

Still farther :

"Man shall mix with Deity
And the Eternal and Immortal make
One Being."—p. 393.

God is expressly called the "great world-soul." Mind is called "pure power—pure god." Space is called a "quality of God." But enough. If this is not Pantheism, Xenophanes and Plotinus, Giordano Bruno and Spinoza, must stand acquitted. Connected, as there always is, with this pantheistic tendency, is a tendency to *fatalism*. This flows like a deep under-current through the whole book. Yet it rarely breaks upon the surface,

and flows so silently that you scarcely note it. Still you cannot but feel its presence, inexorable as the force which binds the stars.

Again, there is an imperfect apprehension of the evil of sin. In a pantheistic system, indeed, the deformity of sin is always overshadowed. It is part of the universe, part of the development of God, and must be explained in some way. Lucifer calls himself "the shadow which creation casts from God's own light," and declares that he is inseparable from the universe. Hear Festus after making an apology for the sad fate of the loved ones he had deserted :

"Let us work out our natures ; we can do
No wrong in them, they are divine, eterne :
I follow my attraction, and obey
Nature, as earth does."—p. 279.

Hear him again when about appearing in the presence of his Judge :

"Forgiveness ? Let it be so : for I know not
What I have done to merit endless pain.
Is pleasure crime ?"—p. 386.

Again :

"Thou wilt not chronicle our sandlike sins ;
For sin is small, and mean, and barren. Good
Only is great, and generous, and fruitful.
Number the mountains, not the sands, O God !"

Sin, in any form is too insignificant to merit eternal punishment. Listen to the Son of God in Hell itself :

"There is nothing final
In all this world but God ; therefore these souls
Whom I see here, and pity for their woes—
But for their evil more—these need not be
Inhelled for ever ; for although once, twice, thrice,
On earth or here they may have put God from them,
Disowned His prophets—mocked His angels—slain
His Son in his mortality—and stormed
His curses back to Him ; yet God is such,
That He can pity still ; and I can suffer
For them, and save them."—p. 827.

It is this imperfect apprehension of the evil of sin, together with a milk-and-water conception of the goodness and benevolence

of God, that is the moving cause; in the author's mind, of the restoration of Lucifer and the fallen angels without repentance and in spite of themselves. Their sin was involved in the constitution of the universe, and so was the atonement of Christ to balance it; and destiny must have its way. It would be interesting and instructive to compare with these views some passages from "the book God writ of old," and see the comparative place which sin holds in the two pictures.

We feel constrained to enter this strong caveat against the theology of a book, which, notwithstanding its great faults, we have read with exhaustless pleasure; and which, we feel sure, will be transmitted to coming ages, as a monument of genius, if nothing else. That it may be made servicable to some minds, we are confident; that it may be deleterious to others, we are apprehensive; that it will make the world better, we are rather desirous than sanguine.

Oh! when will poetry escape from the damp fog of a vain philosophy, and spread its wing in the pure azure of heavenly truth! When will genius be baptised in "Siloah's brook which flows fast by the oracle of God," and sit and learn at the feet of him who "spake as never man spake!" When shall every Byron's head be joined with a Pollok's heart! In that day, when "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" shall be upon the bells of the horses; and when "there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts."

Carlisle, Pa.

J. C.

THE CICADAÆ.

THE ambrosial days of the cicadae or the tettiges are clean gone forever! They did belong to the morning of Greece; the golden age of that country. "When Music, heavenly maid, was young," the charming voices of these insectile foresters were properly appreciated. The same tasteful ears, which were capable of catching the distant music of the spheres and of being pleased thereby, were turned also in delicate admiration towards the chirpings of these lowlier, noonday quiristers. The poets especially were taken with them. Hesiod mentions them as the dark-winged, musical tettiges, foretelling the approach of Summer; and Homer calls them the lily-voiced, borrowing his metaphor from the most delicate of flowers. The Athenians saw in them so many traits of character resembling their own, that they regarded them with fraternal affections, and believed that they were possessed of souls and, of course, of human feelings. Like themselves they were indigenous to the soil, and fond of disputation and of song, and of basking in the sunshine of the present. How beautiful is the apologue of Plato respecting them, which he represents Socrates introducing by way of episode, while discoursing apart with his beloved Phædrus, under the plane tree, on love and philosophy!

"*Socrates*.—Spare time indeed we have on hands, as it seems; and now the cicadae, who, as their wont is in the heat, are chanting and disputing over our heads, it strikes me, are looking down upon us. Should they therefore behold us two, like many others, at noon-day, not discoursing but, through laziness of thought, becoming lulled with their music, justly, in sooth, would we excite their derision; they supposing us to be some loafers who had come apart hither to them in this retired spot, like sheep, to take a nap at noonday near the fountain. But, on the other hand, should they behold us discoursing and, as it were, sailing past them, as by Sirens, unseduced by their strains, highly delighted thereat they would be, and perhaps bestow upon us that boon with which the gods have entrusted them for mortals.

"*Phædrus* —But what now is that boon with which the gods have entrusted them? for, as it seems, about this matter I am still uninformed.

"*Socrates*.—In sooth it is not proper that, at any rate, a man devoted to the Muses should, about such matters, be uninformed. It is said then that these cicadae were once men; before the

times of the Muses ; but when the Muses were born and song was displayed, so smitten were some of these men, at that time, with pleasure from it that singing they neglected both their food and drink ; and, on this account unweetingly they came to their untimely ends. From these, however, afterwards sprang up the race of the cicadae, having been endowed by the Muses with this boon, that from the moment of their births they should require no aliment to support them, but without eating and drinking they should continue singing till the days of their departures ; but then, having come to the Muses, it was their bounden duty to report who among mortals they were that revered the Muses and which particular Muse it was that any mortal preferred. To Terpsichore, therefore, on the one hand, they announce who are those that honor her in their dances, and thus they render such persons more beloved. To Erato, on the other hand, they announce who are those that honor her in their amatory strains ; and to the other Muses, in like manner, according to the peculiar provinces of each. To Calliope, however, the most honorable, and, after her, to Urania they announce who are those that pass their time in philosophy, and pursue those arts which are peculiarly theirs ; and then these, who, of all the Muses, are most conversant about heaven and speeches both human and divine, bestow sweetness of speech. Thus, for many reasons, we must talk about something and not sleep at noonday."—*Phaed.* 259.

Of course it was not the intention here of the honey-lipped Plato, to deny that the cicadae were fond of the dew. Their love for this beverage was so well known to the Athenians, that it needed not to be noted by him as an exception. The dew was scattered so plentifully on the leaves before these musicians in the morning, that it required no care nor trouble on their parts to go after it. It interfered not with their singing. They partook of it too not at all as an aliment, but merely for exhilaration. It served to moisten and thus lubricate their throats—or more properly, I should say, those natural bagpipes of theirs under their arms or wings from which their music issued. The shepherds sympathised with these natives, from hearing them contending in song above their heads among the branches, while themselves were engaged in the same delectable employment on the grass in the shade beneath. From their bibacious propensity, however, their disposition to sip the dew and become thus exhilarated, and even intoxicated, it was, we imagine, that the lyric poets were most taken with them. They fancied them to be good fellows well met, full of kindness towards each other, and in good humor with the world and all around them. From

being possessed with some such notion; no doubt, it was that Anacreon was the more inspired, when he responded to one of them in that well known lyric :

ANACREON, ODE XLIII.

Μαχαρίζομαι σε, τίττις,

K. τ. λ.

"Happy thee we deem, cicada,
As from out the leafy tree-top,
On a little dew enlivened,
Like a monarch, thou art singing.
Thine the things are all around thee,
Whatsoe'er in fields thou seest,
Whatsoe'er the woods are bearing.
Thou beloved art of tillers,
Any ill to no one doing;
Thou art highly prized by mortals,
Of the summer sweet foreteller.
Fond of thee too are the Muses,
Fond of thee himself Apollo;
And a clear-voiced song he gave thee.
Old age thee doth never trouble,
Wise one, earth-born, fond of singing,
Painless, with a bloodless body,
Almost to the gods thou'rt equal."

The pleased cicada who was honored with this strain, no doubt, in his proper time, like a carrier pigeon, not, however, written down but treasured in his memory, conveyed it to the bowers of the Muses, where in appropriate, imitative style, he rehearsed it to Terpsichore and Erato, who, in their turns, being highly pleased therewith, as is likely, bestowed as a guerdon on their poet a double portion of their spirit. To their fondness for dew-drinking, rather than to their passion for song, I am inclined to think it was owing, that these cicadae were enabled to preserve their immortality. Before the times of the Rosicrucians, the Grecians were of the opinion that the dew drops, which were the tears of Aurora, were somewhat tinctured with the nectar of the higher world, and on that account possessed of the power of bestowing upon those who partook of them largely a never-fading bloom of health and beauty. By these ancients consequently it was believed that the cicadae never died. Very properly, therefore, was Tithonus, the beloved spouse of Aurora, when he had become an old and decrepit man, transformed into one of these insects; for thus while re-

taining his immortality as before, he regained in the metamorphosis, what his lady-love had unfortunately forgotten to ask for him at first from Jupiter, his continued youth and sprightliness. In the legend of Plato, however, above cited, which was spoken when entomology had been a little more studied, it must be confessed they are allowed to be mortal. During the summer, it seems there to be insinuated, they all sooner or later dropped off. It was only their souls that continued to survive. I cannot help thinking, however, that the fabulist does not mean to assert that they shuffled off entirely their corporeal coils. It was only a sort of transformation they underwent. As when emerging from their aurelean state to enter upon their earthly festivities they had burst their shells, and come forth in more genteel forms, so now, at the close of these, when about to enter into a higher sphere, they threw off their outward integuments, their souls did not come forth naked, but possessed of more sylph-like bodies, away they flitted, with improved voices, and on ambrosial wings, into the bowers of the Muses.

As the Romans honored and invoked the Muses, into whose mysteries they had been initiated by the Greeks, it might naturally have been expected that they would have regarded with equally good feelings their winged messengers or prophets. As they had received from the anterior people above mentioned most of their mythology, and caught from them besides, to a great extent, their literary tastes and dilections, it might certainly have been with fairness inferred that they would have listened accordingly in charmed admiration to the cheerful chirpings of these little votaries of the Pierides. Of this, however, I am grieved to say it, no corroborations are to be met with in their books. From their classical associations, the Latin poets were, no doubt, disposed to regard these insects with interest and delight; but from their own experience, as they heard them every summer from their trees, having no ear for their music, they were not so favorably inclined. Belonging to a more warlike and practical nation they were fonder of the bees. Thus Virgil in his *Bucolics*, it is true, where he imitates to a great extent the Grecian verses of Theocritus, associates the cicadae with classical beings and beautiful things; as, for instance, in *Eclogue V* he prophesies that Daphnis would continue to receive honors and praises from the shepherds as long as the bees would be fond of thyme or the cicadae of the dew; but in his *Georgics*, where he draws his lessons and associations more directly from his native fields and woods, he speaks of them less respectfully:

"Et cantu querelae rumpent arbustae cicadae."

He here describes these almost deified minstrels of the Greeks in his own country as actually about to burst the orchards with their incessant, querulous croakings! O, what a falling off was there, my countrymen! No guerdon I trow, would the Mantuan bard be likely to receive from the Muses, at any rate through the intervention of these their tiny messengers, for his having written on them such a line as that.

If even the Roman poets, so closely allied as they were by their literary associations to the Greeks, were yet incapable of properly appreciating the musical abilities of these insects, it is not so much to be wondered at that our modern bards, of different habits and in colder climates, are affected towards them with feelings still less Attical. The fact is the cicadae are seldom if ever mentioned by our modern poets at all. It is only in prose writings now-a-days, by entomologists or compilers of antiquarian dictionaries, they are described; and generally, at the outset, in some such style as this:

“Cicada, a species of insect frequently mentioned by the classical writers. According to Dodwell it is formed like a large fly, with long transparent wings, a dark brown back and yellow belly. It is originally a caterpillar, then a chrysalis and is converted into a fly late in the Spring.”——

To the description thus far we put in no demurrer. The cicada among insects, like the nightingale among birds or Jenny Lind among human beings, though genteel enough in his outward appearance, is not in that way remarkable. It is not by gaudy colorings, like the butterfly, that he attracts attention. His whole fort is in his singing. Let us hear then what Mr. Dodwell says of that:

“Dodwell says that nothing is so piercing as their note; nothing at the same time so tiresome and inharmonious, and yet the ancient writers and especially the poets praise the sweetness of their song and Plutarch says they were sacred to the Muses.”—*Anthon's Gr. and Lat. Antiq.*

And pray, Mr. Dodwell, whose taste in this particular should be considered the more correct, thine own or that of Plutarch? The Greeks, it is well known, even in their common converse, modulated and intonated their voices so correctly and musically that they seemed almost to be speaking in numbers. Their language, however, on account of its nice inflections and cadences, our thicker Saxon tongues are not sufficiently pliable nor nimble to pronounce properly, and its full beauty and delight, even did

we hear it well spoken, our less aesthetical ears would, in all likelihood, be unqualified for appreciating. Is it not then more than probable that the exquisitely tuned ears of this people were thrilled with melodies from these insects, the most ethereal and refined, which, though still mingled with their music, our grosser senses are totally incapable of taking in?

The ancient Greeks were naturally drawn to pay more attention to the music of birds and insects than has been done by the modern Britons, on account of their spending more of their time out of doors. Owing to their more salubrious atmosphere they could cast themselves, without any detriment to their health or spirits, beneath the shades of trees, and listen improvingly to the chirpers on the branches. Of course, however, according to their tastes, they studied them always more poetically than scientifically. The later Britons, on the other hand, on account of their colder climate, and the happy influences, it becomes me to admit, of christianity on their domestic relations, are fonder of their firesides. Not so much to be wondered at therefore is it that the song of the cicada, if in fact he belong to their country at all, has not been wont to suggest such pleasing associations to the British poets as have been the chirpings of a smaller insect, of a darker hue and without wings, which is accustomed to hail them of an evening from his snug and secret retreat somewhere in the jambs of their fire-places.

“ Little inmate, full of mirth
Chirping on my kitchen hearth,
Wheresoe'er be thine abode,
Always harbinger of good,” &c.

This affectionate ode thus commencing of Vincent Bourne, translated by Cowper, is not a solitary instance, in British poetry, of honor paid to this little colored musician. From Chaucer down to Tennyson his name occurs in almost every description of domestic peace and happiness. Mine own lineage being derived partly from Scottish ancestors, I confess that I have always had, at any rate in the winter, something of a warm side towards the chimney corner. Seated of an evening solitary by mine ingle side frequently have I been soothed, I must admit, and aided in my meditations, by the concomitant chirpings of the contented cricket. Still, I am not pleased with invidious comparisons. The merits of this household serenader, it strikes me, should always be set forth without any disparagement to the cicada of the trees. The two musicians belong to unparallel times and manners. On this account I must say that I am not

at all satisfied with the concluding lines of that domestic ode from which I have already quoted the commencement :

" Though in voice and shape they be
 Formed as if akin to thee,
 Thou surpassest, happier far,
 Happiest grasshoppers that are ;
 Thine is but a summer's song,
 Thine endures the winter long,
 Unimpaired and shrill and clear,
 Melody throughout the year.
 Neither night nor dawn of day
 Puts a period to thy play :
 Sing then, — and extend thy span
 Far beyond the date of man.
 Wretched man whose hours are spent,
 In repining discontent,
 Lives not, aged though he be,
 Half a span compared with thee."

Of all misnomers of which English translators of Greek or Latin have been guilty, (and they are not a few,) I know of none more disparaging and humiliating than that of rendering the name of the divine, tettix or cicada by that of grasshopper! The insect thus denominated amongst us, we all know, is not only gawky in his appearance and groveling in his pursuits, but, as for music, in which the cicada revels, he is utterly devoid both of taste and tune. He is really not able to emit any voice whatever from any part of his body ; and his whole sense of hearing, as I have been told by entomologists, is secreted somewhere in his stuck up thighs, acute enough merely to enable him to discern noises approaching him from behind ; so that with a sudden jerk of these his auditory members he can fling himself out of their danger ; but of uttering or appreciating melodies he has no idea. Instead of soaring aloft among the tree tops, his highest efforts can throw him only on the topmost rails of fences. To think of denoting by such a name the distinguished Athenian vocalist ! Yet the English translators of Greek and Latin authors seldom bestow on him any other appellation. Of course, in the ode above extracted from, Cowper, among the tuneful grasshoppers mentioned, means to include our little Attic warbler. Not to dwell, however, on the indignity inflicted on him, in being thus miscalled, the classical translator of this ode, as well as its original composer, was certainly not ignorant of the Grecian legends respecting him. His song on earth, we admit, continues but for a summer ; yet should not

these two learned poets, to have done our client justice, made at least some allusion to the many happy thousand years he thereafter spends, in his promoted, improved condition, within the gardens of the Pierides? The cricket, on the other hand, is topical and mortal. Ever merry and untiring he may serenade, night after night, for years, the successive members of the same household; but his song at length must come to an end. Should he even escape all the many casualties to which he is liable, as the scorching of coals, the falling of tongs, or the pouncing of cats upon him; whenever he may venture forth from his salubrious retreat, still his life is not immortal. Even should it be prolonged far beyond the date of man's, it must sometime be brought to a close; if not sooner, at any rate "amid the wreck of matter and the crush" of the falling in of the jambs of his fire-place. These Lares must perish ultimately with the downfall of their chimney corners.

Both the cicada and cricket are to be met with in the United States; but while admiring them for their musical abilities and literary associations we are not disposed to adopt either of them for our national serenader. With Bryant we think it highly improper to call up, amid these virgin solitudes and twittering forests, "the faded fancies of an elder world." To be heard in our trees are enough of musical insects, of equal voices to the cicada's and yet more American and patriotic in their habits and feelings; from which, I have no doubt, in due time, our poets will select their appropriate favorite. Still, in the mean time, I trust I shall not be deemed too officious when I would recommend to their favorable consideration, lest unhappily his merits may be overlooked by them, as a suitable candidate for this high distinction, the modest, shrinking, unpretending, green-coated minstrel called the Katydid. While his notes are somewhat similar and certainly equal in tune, at any rate to my ear, to those of the ancient cicada, he is yet distinguished from the latter by some striking characteristics and differences of his own; all of which qualify him admirably for this selection. In argument he is fully as stiff as was the ancient disputant. The speeches of the old men of Troy reminded Homer of the chirpings of the cicada, and in a like manner, but in an inverted order, the song also of the katydid reminded Thomas Haynes Bayly of the speeches of old men:

"Thou mind'st me of some gentlefolks, old gentlefolks are they,
Thou say'st an undisputed thing in such a solemn way."

This shows that their voices are somewhat akin. From the
VOL. III.—NO. V. 28

similarity too of their names which were formed, no doubt, at first from the respective sounds of their voices, we may infer the same thing: *Cicada*, *Katydid*, *Tettiges*. On the other hand, between them are appropriate national differences. The ancient Greeks were wholly eastern in their feelings and connections, almost worshippers of the dawn and devoted to their present enjoyments. The cicada, in unison with them, sipped the dew of the morning, and afterwards basked and sang in "the liquid noon," of day, unmindful of to-morrow. We Americans, on the other hand, are altogether western in our habits and associations. While enjoying sufficiently the present we still turn our eyes longingly towards the setting sun. We are more disposed, or at any rate we should be, by our religion to cast our hopes into the future, and contemplate with the eye of faith the brighter realities of another world. The katydid, in sympathy with us, while sufficiently cheerful, is yet more thoughtful in his habits; and he never commences singing until the evening twilight, nor does he tire in his notes until he perceives breaking forth the incipient streaks of a happier dawn. Again, while the voice of the cicada is heard in the Spring and throughout the heat of Summer, the katydid begins not till the evenings are becoming cool again, and he continues his strain till cut off by the frosts of Autumn. He belongs to a later and cooler era in the world's history. The ancient Athenians, it is well known, wore golden images of the cicada, as emblems and ornaments, in their braids of hair knotted on the crowns of their heads. We would, by no means, recommend our countrymen in general to adopt a similar fashion; but would it not be highly proper, when our Government will have appointed a poet laureate, that, half hid among the leaves of his laurels, should be seen lurking every here and there the golden image of a katydid?

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

THE NATURE OF THE REFORMATION AND ITS PREPARATION.

[Translated from the General Introduction of "*Reformatoren vor der Reformation*" by Dr. Ullmann.]

BEFORE entering into an account of some of the more important characters of the fifteenth century whose opinions and conduct tended to produce the Reformation, it is necessary first of all to come to a right understanding of the nature of the *Reformation itself*. For such an understanding is by no means a matter of indifference, because the conception we may have of it exerts an influence upon its historical representation; nor is it by any means a superfluous task, because, in regard to this very point, have been circulated many erroneous opinions as confused in theory as they are pernicious in practise. Both among the enemies of the Reformation and such of its friends whose judgments have been warped by interest in its favor, the opinion is very generally current that the essence of this great religious movement did not consist in a firm adhesion to positive truth, but in a firm opposition to existing errors and abuses. Hence the notion that, inasmuch as errors and abuses exist in every age and place, a reformation may be set in motion at any time and place, as the caprice of men may dictate. It must be borne in mind, however, as a truth of prime importance, that that which deserves the name of Reformation cannot be manufactured or invented by man, and that which can be thus fabricated, merits not this great name. In the highest sense of the term a Reformation is always the last result of powerful tendencies previously at work in the course of history, the vigorous outburst of a spiritual process which displays its energetic presence in the movements of centuries. It is the last result of a pressing necessity which lays hold on the deepest wants of an age and attaches every thing to its course with irresistible power;—a necessity which, though it allows room for the free play of personal action and manifests its nature through the agency of representative men, roots itself in the fertile soil of a general mind which permeates the structure of the social system and struggles to expose its desires and thoughts. As a Reformation cannot spring forth full-grown from the brain of a single man, so, too, this common aspiration after it cannot be excited by the action of the self-willed enthusiast, it is the offspring of a violent hankering after spiritual manna, grows in strength as

spiritual famine sharpens the appetite for the food of spiritual life, and comes to maturity by the force of its own internal energy. In the nature of such a continuous spiritual process will be lodged an animating principle, a positive substance, for something merely negative, as scepticism, the rejection of an existing order or mere opposition to it, cannot of itself unite men and put them at variance for centuries. Neither in the physical nor in the moral world, is it possible for anything to assume an organic and permanent form unless there be at hand a germ full of living powers which has in it potentially, in a latent form, that which comes to view when it is fully matured. This germ, too, always contains a positive energy, inasmuch as it first unfolds its own peculiar character and then, in order to gain full scope for uninterrupted growth, comes into collision with that which is alien to it and clears away every element which might check its progress. This general law we also observe in every occurrence which, in the sphere of religion, may be justly and pertinently called a Reformation. A Reformation is reconstruction, a restoration of life. In this definition, however, are included three essential items. In the first place, it is a return to something already given to man, to some original fact. For the Reformation, which must be distinguished from the establishment of religion and the founding of the primitive Church, does not design to call into being something absolutely new and previously unknown, but aims at the renovation of something already established. It confines its operations, then, within the bounds of a given historical domain and, in the moment of encroachment upon territory lying beyond, loses its character altogether. In the second place, it is not merely a return to the original element of christianity, an acknowledgement of it and an earnest aspiration after it, but above all, a hearty, energetic restoration of it and a successful reduction to practical life of that which is thus confessed to be genuine in the christian system. Herein, particularly, consists its practical; positive nature. It is a great historical fact which, as it rests upon a given basis clearly apprehended and confessed by the general consciousness, in turn lays the foundation for a fresh, more perfect growth of the religious spirit. Finally, the nature of the Reformation requires that it should combat the false and abolish the obsolete and that the positive element should assume an offensive attitude. For the very fact that it is to effect the revival of an original power implies that this last has been disfigured and adulterated and that the perversions of it must be rectified. Moreover, in order to secure ample opportunities for the workings of its renewing pow-

er, it must seek to abolish the obsolete institutions which only serve to interrupt its course. But a Reformation, if it be of the right character, is never a mere demolition of any existing state, but a reconstruction which unavoidably destroys the useless and unnecessary.

That these characteristics which belong to the nature of the Reformation, come to light in the ecclesiastical renovation of the sixteenth century no one will deny. It is a going back with clear consciousness to the original element of christianity and moves, in its essential forms, in the christian sphere. By means of a series of magnificent acts and in accordance with the extent of its knowledge, it reduces to actual practise this original element and, in order to acquire room for freedom of action, rejects firmly and energetically every thing alien to it. But that it should assume the character of a world-historical act in which the most accomplished nations of Europe, namely, the earnest, profound and energetic nations of German origin, and within their borders, all orders, the princes and nobles, the learned and artists, the citizens and farmers should participate, that it should become an act which forms the turning point of history from the Mediaeval to the Modern period and the central power to this very day of all progress in the spiritual world ;—is not conceivable except as we take into account many pre-existing circumstances. An event of such universal influence must have, like the gigantic oak, deep, wide-spread roots, and a firm foundation out of which it has sprung. In such a case, it is a sure sign of a paltry insight into the interior sense of history to explain its rise and progress by referring them either to personal motives or transient interests. Such circumstances, indeed, are not to be overlooked, but the truly great, the general, the lasting in history proceeds from causes more profound. Persons do not manufacture it ; they are its servants and become themselves really great when they occupy this subordinate position with conscious conviction and fixed purpose of will ; their greatness increases precisely in proportion as they yield themselves voluntary instruments for bringing to pass the ends of history.

Ere a Reformation can take place, three conditions must be at hand : in the department to be reformed, a corruption must really exist ; the necessity for the removal of it must be generally felt and consciously acknowledged ; and the foundations of the new order which is to supersede the old, must have been previously laid. It is only when these conditions are present that a period for reformatory proceedings dawns upon the world. And it is only in such a period—not in a time which may seem to suit

the fancy of any one—that true Reformers can make their appearance. For it is only in the presence of such conditions that their labors can be crowned with triumphant success.

To prove that in the course of centuries prior to the ecclesiastical renovation in Germany and Switzerland a corruption of christian doctrine and life had extensively prevailed, might furnish matter enough to fill a whole volume. We will state its main features in general outline. Christianity entered into human nature as the principle of a new life, as a fresh creative spirit which, in the course of historical development, should penetrate and regenerate the nations. It dwelt at first in the internal man and existed in the form of a firm and all-conquering conviction of a communion with a gracious God restored by the Saviour, and of a life of love and the freest morality which sprang from this conviction and a lively faith. This internal spirit of faith, if it was destined to escape dissolution, to exist as a permanent power in the human race and to survive the storms of ages, must necessarily, as is demanded by the very nature of a creative faith, construct a body for its habitation. The body of the spirit implanted into humanity by Christ is the Church. The Church necessarily originated from the nature of christianity which impels to the formation of a community and was of indispensable service in fulfilling its world-embracing mission as prescribed by its Author himself and the great Apostle of the Gentiles. But there is no possibility of a Church without an outward substratum, without a fixed form of doctrine, of worship, and of government. Of all these the Gospel contained the principles, the germs, but not the detailed forms and definitions. These last it was intended should be the free production of humanity enlightened and penetrated by the spirit of christianity. In the nature of the case, it was necessary that, in the forming of an ecclesiastical body, men should enlist in the service of the christian revelation certain portions of what was already at hand in the Jewish and Heathen civilization, religious, scientific, and political. In this way originated a form of doctrine modified by the influence particularly of heathen culture; of worship and government, by an assimilation particularly of Jewish forms of church fellowship. This was a process in accordance with the state of things, and, indeed, wholly unobjectionable whilst material analogous to the christian system was used in the formation of the several parts of the christian communion and whilst the animating spirit of the latter was strong enough to rule and vivify a body constructed in such style. But a period arrived in which such was not the case. By an inter-

mixture and interchange of the principles of the Old and New Testament dispensations and a certain preponderance of heathen philosophy, uncongenial elements were introduced. With the elevation of Christianity to the Imperial throne the great mass of heathens were taken into the Church. Now it was impossible to stem the mighty influx of Pagan elements. There was formed a body of the Church over which the spirit of the Gospel exerted not exclusive control.

This is evidenced by a consideration of the three radical parts which constitute the ecclesiastical life, doctrine, government and Cultus. In the department of doctrine, the influence of Hellenic philosophy and of the heathen mode of thought in general converted a large portion of Christianity, which is religion, into Metaphysics and speculation and substituted for the doctrine of salvation through Christ that of righteousness by works; of government, the interchange of the Old and New Testament standpoint threw reproach on the primitive idea of the universal priesthood of Christians and put in a prominent position the necessity of a special priesthood; of worship, which is closely connected with this interchange because the priest, it was said, must also have a real offering to present, the simple, devout service and love-feast of the first christians was supplanted by that form of the Lord's Supper which treated it as a continually repeated offering of the God-man who was supposed to be spiritually and bodily present. In the Eastern Church we first discover the transplantation of christianity from the sphere of religion to that of Metaphysics and speculation, accompanied at the same time with a disregard of its practical character. This tendency, however, continued its course, with the addition of new elements, in the scholasticism of the West which at first served to call forth fresh energy and gigantic productions, but gradually engendered such extreme formalism that it became necessary either to combat it with sturdy opposition or to allow christianity to be stripped of its living power and converted into an abstract doctrine, to be withdrawn from the congregation and imprisoned in the schools. The conversion of the Gospel of grace into a doctrine of salvation by outward actions appears in its ripest form in the Pelagianism of the Western Church. Though publicly condemned by the Church, it grew luxuriantly and gave rise to manifold corruptions both in the East where its roots had acquired bulk and extension by age, and in the West where monasticism and scholasticism fought its battles. From its operation in the occident proceeded the notion of the meritoriousness of moral works, the dogma of the treasure of merits, the

entire system of indulgences, and the decline of monkery. Its chief influence, however, comes to light in the fact that it changed the Gospel into a system of law, of precepts which concerned not only the Jews but had reference to all nations. The rise of a separate priesthood regarded as being in itself holy and divine which flourished in the West, wrought a thorough change in the spiritual relation of christians to God and the Saviour, and originated the entire system of the Hierarchy and of the Papacy which now took the place of the original equality that obtained between the christian congregations. Finally, the idea of a sacrifice in the administration of the Lord's Supper became the centre of that mysterious and splendid cultus which, so long as there existed a living consciousness of its meaning, powerfully excited and overawed susceptible dispositions. In no long time, however, it degenerated into empty formalism, suppressed the worship of the spirit and of the heart, and thrust into the background the doctrine of salvation which is absolutely essential to the integrity of the christian system.

Christianity in this form offered its presents to the Germanic nations which could perceive in it no perversion of the original because they knew of no other system. Still, along with this shell they obtained the kernel of the Gospel; and it may be affirmed that, in the case of these untutored, unpolished nations, a training like that effected by the hierarchy was absolutely necessary, which curbed their self will by its rigid law, excited their religious susceptibilities by a rich, symbolic worship, and filled their souls with the presentiment of celestial mysteries. Accordingly, they not only progressed under the tuition of this system but unfolded it to its richest bloom. The Hierarchy, the Papacy, Scholasticism, the Cultus so beautifully decorated with the most magnificent imagery, matured their best fruits among these people. At the same time, however, deep in their constitution had been implanted a principle of opposition to the Papacy which demonstrated its presence by turning men's thoughts inwardly upon the movements of their consciousness, by inducing a feeling of spiritual freedom and independence. This principle is intimately connected with the original character of christianity and cannot be separated from it. It may be said, indeed, that these nations were predestined for christianity and christianity for them; they seem to have been foreordained to develop most energetically and fully the christian spirit. On this account it might easily happen that, having attained to a higher and more independent state of culture and to a knowledge of the original essence of the christian revelation, they would stir up

opposition to a system of thought and action which tied christianity to the mere performance of ceremonial duties, converted it into an unbending dogmatism and an outward rule, and sanctioned the abuses of sacerdotal tyranny. It is not meant that Europe generally took no part in this reaction against the Hierarchy; it is simply affirmed that the honor of giving it birth clearly belongs to the Germanic people, for the final decision was announced in Germany, and Luther, who of all Germans best represents the German character, stood at the head of this christian and national movement.

Ere such an event, however, could make its appearance, a historical process continuing through centuries and designed to prepare men for its reception, was necessary. Defects and perversions of the christian system were extant, but the case required that they should be acknowledged and felt as such. Such a state of mind, however, is not produced suddenly and by a single agency, but gradually and by the combined operation of several different forces. The Church is an organism of very complicated structure; it has an inward and an outward being, it embraces, under various relations which act and re-act upon one another, doctrine, life, government and worship. All this, it is true, proceeds from and is determined by some central power, which is the ruling spirit of the Church, in such a way that when the spirit labors under disease, its varied manifestations of religious life are unsound and when the spirit suffers, the outward form of the Church exhibits symptoms of disease more or less fatal. Yet, to fathom the inmost depths of the ecclesiastical spirit and from thence to estimate phenomena, is a privilege granted only to the keen-eyed, practised thinker; whilst those who never go beyond the surface of things, will never go beyond the externals of ecclesiastical life. For this reason the opposition was first directed against the external, only gradually against the internal, and at last against the general corruption that reigned in the Church. The external which immediately excites the senses is the Cultus. Accordingly, we find that single men and small parties who strongly insisted on an inward holy worship of God, the baptism of the Spirit, the prayer of the heart, the practical in christianity, first waged war against the continual increase of ceremonies and ecclesiastical pomp and the false overvaluation of good works, with a zeal which sprang from laudable motives but was often accompanied with wild fanaticism. In the 11th century already we find several small sects of this description in France and Germany which the Church condemned as Manicheans. Of these the Petrobru-

sians and Henricians deserve special mention because of their great zeal and radical character. But the style of Cultus then extant rooted itself in the hierarchical government of the Church, and as the Papacy in this period increased in power and uttered its threats with firmer voice, it came to pass by necessity that the war which was carried on against the style of worship, would be waged also against the dominant hierarchy and the general state of the Church. Of this tendency Arnold of Brescia, the Albigenses, and in parts the Stedinger of Germany, were the representatives. But the Hierarchy again directed attention to the general condition of the christian life, for its existence in such connection could be possible only in an age in which christianity had departed from its original tendency and vocation. Attempts were now made to lead the christian life back to its primitive purity, to the simplicity and glory of the Apostolic age. The Apostolic practise became the watchword of the parties which were dissatisfied with the Church. A peculiar order of Brothers of the Apostles was instituted. To the Waldenses belongs the honor of having developed with great success this tendency in its purest forms. In the very moment men turned their eyes back to the Apostolical they planted themselves on the authority of the Scriptures which had hitherto been kept in the dark and elevated it to the rank of the rule of Faith. Such was the case with the Waldenses and with all those who were in search of a piety more profound and earnest than generally obtained. In the course of time this appeal to the Bible as the final tribunal brought men into direct conflict with the dominant doctrine. This contradiction to the existing faith constituted the very gist of the opposition. Now it happened that the spirit of discontent left the ranks of the people within which it had hitherto been confined, and took hold of the higher orders, of theologians and the literati whose special business it was to search the scriptures and complete the doctrinal scheme. Now appeared men like Wicliff, Huss, Jerome of Prague, and several French theologians of distinction. The chief merit of these men who began their actions from the very centre of the spirit and of doctrine, consists in their having regard not only to single abuses but to the corrupt state of the whole Church, in their referring the cause of this corruption not to mere external circumstances and particular abuses but to the general spiritual decay of the whole Church, in their uniting in fair harmony well regulated zeal with accurate knowledge.

The spirit of opposition having, after the lapse of four hundred years, assailed the corruptions of the Church from all sides

and penetrated all classes, the lowest as well as the highest, the ignorant as well as the learned, and having failed to induce the enactment of ordinances for the improvement of the Church, a part of whose clergy sank more hopelessly into the abyss of vice, it came to pass by necessity that the desire for a Reformation became a matter of public concern, a popular interest in the fullest sense of the term, that the great Councils of the West, in the face of all Europe, and with special earnestness and zeal, legislated upon the subject, that the Imperial Diets continued to insist with increased importunity on a consideration of this point and that the whole of Europe resounded in every nook and corner with clamors for an improvement of morals. Such was notoriously the condition of things. A fact of this order must have sprung from solid causes. It cannot be doubted that a necessity for a Reformation, deeply rooted and generally acknowledged, was at hand. The negative condition for the appearance of such an event, had been fulfilled.

But something more of greater account was necessary ; a positive element which consisted in the incipient presence of the fundamental principles of that which was effected by the Reformation. It was requisite that the spirit which was to be poured afresh upon the world by means of the Reformation should have displayed its power in individuals and smaller corporations, and that the purer conception of the christian faith which was to reconstruct after the primitive pattern the christian life should have evinced its efficiency in living manifestations out of which, if not in an outward yet in an inward connection, the theology of the Reformation might proceed. Now, this positive element was also at hand. That which constitutes the peculiar feature in the convictions and tendencies of the Reformers, although they possessed it in an original form and as an integral portion of their own spiritual life, was not something absolutely new ; for the radical elements of it were included in the nobler spirit of the age and had been already developed, to a great extent, by several conspicuous personages. It was the special vocation of the Reformers clearly and convincingly to arrange these elements in their proper relation to the governing influence of a living faith, to reduce to actual practise what had previously been a mere wish and feeling, and to make the better theology of single men the foundation for the confirmation of a large communion.

We may regard, as the fundamental element of the Reformation which includes all its other characteristics, the firm conviction that salvation comes not from man but from God. The leading object of the Reformers was to prostrate before God and

Christ everything human, no matter how venerable its antiquity or how lofty its position in the Church, to give all honor to God and the Saviour, to separate from the christian faith and life everything which seemed to conflict with the honor of God and His word, and to restore the proper relation between man and his Maker by making Christ the only Mediator. This tendency, in the sphere both of christian doctrine and life, we find at work among the forerunners of the Reformation, so that through them was already present the material as well as formal principle of that great movement. That which these men brought to a clearer and more general acknowledgment is, on the one hand, the necessity of going back to the Scriptures as the pure word of God in opposition to human teachings and human traditions and of constructing in a purer, more evangelical form the christian faith and life in detail upon the basis of Scripture rightly interpreted and of the practise of the Apostolic Church rightly copied; on the other hand, the firm conviction that perfect peace with God and true happiness could not spring from any human activity or works prescribed by the Church, but from Divine grace revealed in Christ and received by an energetic faith, that the nearest and only safe way to God was not the Church and her prescriptions which were heavily laden with human additions, but Christ, the Redeemer and Mediator, and His Spirit which maketh free and leadeth into all truth and holiness.

We discover, as was to be expected, in their forerunners the same peculiarities which marked the Reformers themselves. They did not exhibit, it is true, the same fullness, symmetry and harmony of character, but, as precursors, they possessed these characteristics in an inferior degree. From this point of view, they may be divided into two classes. In the case of the Reformers, particularly of those whose influence was universally felt, we find a perfect union and intermixture of conviction and action, of theological thought and ecclesiastical practise. So, too, in regard to their forerunners, but in an inferior degree and with the difference that with some predominated practical activity in behalf of the Church, with others theological investigation; the former, among whom may be numbered Huss, Jerome of Prague and Savonarola, exerted a more wide spread influence on the great mass and, in their opposition to the dominant power, were often disposed to fly away from its control, whilst the latter, such as John of Goch, John of Wesel and John Wessel, exerted a greater influence in a theological respect by their profound speculations and retired within the precincts of their own spirits. As regards this last mentioned class, another

difference obtains. With the Reformers the positive and negative elements were combined in fair proportions. So, too, in regard to their forerunners, but in such a way that with some of them, as John von Goch, the positive predominated, with others, as John von Wesel, the polemic, whilst in John Wessel the two were united in the greatest uniformity. Finally, we may make another distinction. That which in the Reformation stood opposed to the scholastic period, was a living Scriptural theology. This was obtained in two ways, either scientifically or practically, in the school of speculation or experience. The one was prepared negatively by opposing and abolishing scholasticism, positively by the revival of the study of the ancient languages and literature and by the re-establishment of a theological system not based upon the tradition of the Church and Schools but upon the pure foundation of the Bible; the other was prepared by the purer, more practical mysticism and by religious incitements among all classes, particularly among the people, which proceeded from the use of the Scriptures. Thus we can divide the forerunners of the Reformation into those who stimulated the people to action, as Gerhard Groot and the brothers of the Common Life, into practico-mystical, as Thomas A'Kempis, learned and philological, as Agricola, Reuchlin and Erasmus, and theological, as John von Goch and John Wessel.

Mercersburg, Pa.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

[An extract from Thiersch's Lectures.]

THE holy Eucharist differs in this from all other sacraments, in the Catholic system, that it is taken to be not only a sacrament, but at the same time also a sacrifice and in this view a real propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead. In comparing the Catholic doctrine with our own then, it must be considered under such twofold aspect, first as a *sacrament* and afterwards as a *sacrifice*.

Taking it up now in the first view, we feel here more than anywhere besides the need of understanding fairly, at the outset, what is to be regarded as the actual Protestant doctrine. This requires us unavoidably to say something of the difference, which rent Protestantism within the first ten years of its history into two churches.

No regard will be had in the case, however, to what has been thought and spoken on the subject of this controversy by certain modern theologians, who let us know more or less plainly that they do not pretend to be governed in their judgment simply by the Bible, or to interpret it with believing submission from itself only and not from a foreign source. From such Protestantism no salvation is to be expected for the cause to which it belongs, and it can have no part, remaining what it now is, in the church of the future. This will know and feel, in proportion precisely to its new experience of the operations and gifts of the Holy Ghost, that it is called to honor in the solemnity of the eucharist a most sacred and unfathomable mystery of Divine love, and that all which pious church teachers of past times have said to magnify it falls short still of the wonders of grace it actually contains.

Looking at our Protestant theology as it now stands, we may say that already all those theologians who profess faith in the real incarnation of the true God in Christ, and submit themselves to the declarations of the Holy Scriptures as infallible oracles of divine wisdom, are more and more agreed in this: That *Zwingli* and *Oecolampadius* went too far, when they found in the Lord's supper *only* a monumental meal, and in the use of it a mere practical demonstration of faith before men; that all those have erred, and do still err, who affirm that the believer receives in the eucharist nothing more than what he has also and may have without it. The necessity of acknowledging a mystery in the sacrament, has become clear for many later theologians particular-

ly from our Lord's discourse in the sixth chapter of John ; where the language is so very strong, that all attempts to resolve it into a figurative or simply spiritualistic sense must be turned by it into confusion. The union with Christ which he there promises to his followers, is just the object itself which the eucharist was instituted afterwards to secure.

We may rid ourselves of Zuingli's view, however, without falling in with the harsh judgments that are again pronounced against this reformer in our own time from the Lutheran side. We know that he was carried into an extreme with his doctrine, through opposition to the Catholic doctrine and practice as they then stood. He proposed to destroy at once the basis of all that appeared to him an abuse in the sacrifice of the mass and its applications, by denying the actual presence of Christ in the Lord's supper. His error, and that of his followers, stood in this, that they supposed it possible *only* in such way to avoid the abuses, which notoriously prevailed in the church at that time. This consideration does not serve to conceal the error of the view in question ; but it so explains it, that while we acknowledge it on the one side to be wrong, we must feel ourselves bound on the other to exercise a becoming indulgence towards the men who first brought it forward.

Calvin struck out a middle view between the Lutheran and Zuinglian, which enabled him first to fall in with the Wittenberg Concord, and then again to unite with the Zuinglian interest in the Consensus Tigurinus. Merely to comprehend his theory, and to state it fairly, is by no means an easy task ; while a just critical estimate of its actual sense may be said to belong to the very hardest problems of theology. When Calvin's doctrine, without opposition at least from *Melancthon*, crept in among the followers of this last in Wittenberg, and led thus to the mighty reaction that followed on the side of strict Lutheranism, the three propositions which became the shibboleth of Lutheran orthodoxy were : the "communication of attributes real and not simply verbal"—an "oral manducation"—and the "manducation of the ungodly." The first of these three propositions, relating to the doctrine of Christ's Person, falls not now in our way ; the second and third define the distinction between the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper and the Calvinistic. As regards now the proposition that unbelievers also receive the Lord's body, there should be no confessional controversy about it ; for it refers to a question, that has no right properly to be presented in the Christian Church. Our Lord did not institute his supper for unbelievers, and their participation in it

is an abnormity, that came not forward in the apostolical age, and is therefore not referred to at all in the New Testament. The apostle speaks indeed of such as partake of the mystery unworthily; they "eat and drink judgment to themselves," by not discerning "the Lord's body." But those unworthy communicants are there not ungodly, not unbelieving. They are believers, who have not made proper preparation. These receive actually the Lord's body; and so much therefore the passage at all events means, that this body is objectively present independently of the communicant's mind; and is received also along with the bread independently of the amount greater or less of his faith and preparation.

But if it be asked now: Is this participation by the mouth? it is necessary to put aside first some misunderstandings, between those who answer *Yes*, and those who answer *No*. It is saying too little, when the Reformed theologians speak of a *cibus mentis* or mental food; since this looks too easily and onesidedly to an activity of reflection, and a presence for memory or at best for the imagination. The right expression has been hit upon here by those Lutheran divines, who require that the body of the Lord shall be owned for a *cibus novi hominis*, an aliment of the new man. For the biblical conception of the "new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," (not to be confounded with the "inner man,") is so deep and comprehensive, that the nourishment of it carries in it a reference of itself also to the future glorification of our bodies. Only then, and in such form, shall we be new men in the whole, made complete as sons of God and set in the full possession of eternal life. The glorification of the body however, or the resurrection to life, is nothing else than a transformation into the likeness of the glorious body of Christ. But now the sure pléde of our glorification, according to the doctrine of the old church which has its ground also in the New Testament, is given in the holy supper. Here we come upon something, which Calvin seeks indeed to reach, but does not fully reach in fact. An excellent and truly enlightened theologian of the present time has well remarked, that nothing is to be asked of the Reformed church, but that she acknowledge in truth the glorification of Christ's body.

In return however, we must also allow, that every doctrine is false which pretends to place the Lord's body in one category with common objects of sense, and so to fix its presence under definite and circumscriptive local dimensions. The holding of the mystery in this way, will be found in truth to overthrow

again both the mystery itself and the glorification of Christ's body.

We are fully convinced, that Christian theology must make up its mind to the unreserved acknowledgment of an objective mystery in the Christian worship. The words used in the institution of the Lord's supper, taken in connection with the general doctrine of the New Testament, are too powerful a testimony here to be disputed. Those who deny it have allowed themselves to be led in part into the sore blunder, of substituting for the Saviour's mystical language, in the distribution of the sacrament, some other form of speech; either, "This is the communion of the body of Christ," or, "Thy faith in the body of Christ, which was delivered up to death, strengthen thee unto eternal life." This however should be as little tolerated, as a change of the formula of baptism. But the proceeding betrays an uncomfortable shyness in regard to our Lord's words, and rests no doubt on some apprehension that the utterance of them, at so sacred a moment, might still call up again the idea of a real mystery.

Altogether then we have a right to bring no other doctrine here into view as Protestant, in contrast with the Catholic, but that of a true real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar, of a presence which depends, not on the faith first that we bring along with us, but on the Redeemer's own institution and promise.

In the Catholic church, this doctrine, founded on the Scriptures and ancient tradition, has grown into the dogma of transubstantiation; and what we have to do now is: first, to place transubstantiation, in itself considered, in comparison with the doctrine of the real presence; secondly, to try the consequences that have been deduced from this Roman dogma, the adoration of the host namely and communion in one kind.

The difference between the doctrine of a real presence, with which the earthly elements retain their substance, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, is not so great as is sometimes supposed. That both come very near together; no one has more clearly proclaimed than Luther; we may say indeed, Luther considered the doctrines to be so related that they might well enough stand both together in the church.

This insight into the smallness of the difference between the two doctrines, may be gained in two ways. First, by considering how gradually and quietly the old christian doctrine passed over into the idea of a change of substance; and then, secondly, by comparing this last in its finished scholastic form with the

Lutheran doctrine. It is hazardous, to aim at finding with full definiteness in antiquity, any one of the modern confessional views. Attempts of this sort lead only too easily to an unhistorical judgment. A strict historical and philological analysis of the patristic doctrine shows rather, that this does not move exactly in the track of any of these later systems. It has its own peculiarities, and must be understood and expounded from itself. It is only a very few points out of this rich subject, that we can allow ourselves to touch upon here.¹

The most learned instructive treatises on the question, whether antiquity favors the Catholic or the Reformed type of doctrine, are those which came out in France and the Netherlands during the seventeenth century. In looking back to these discussions, we must say with *J. A. Ernesti* (in his *Antimuratorius*), that neither of the two parties was able to set antiquity in full unforced harmony with their doctrine. The fathers will not fit themselves to the Reformed scheme, and the oldest of them refuse also to go fully with the Catholic. Very distinct doctrinal expositions occur particularly with these writers, who in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies have defended the one person in two natures and the two natures in one person. They place the mystery of the eucharist in parallel with this dogma; and this, so as to illustrate the integrity of the two natures in Christ, by the conjunction of the earthly and heavenly elements in the sacrament. Here the heavenly element has not yet come to preponderate so completely over the earthly, as in the doctrine which affirms a change of the earthly substance into the heavenly. And yet this last grew very simply, without any spring and by a sort of natural continuity of thought, out of the other, which also it never wholly supplanted in the church. In its scholastic completion, the tenet of transubstantiation separates

¹ It is affirmed in the later manuals of Dogmatic History, since the time of Semler, that the oldest fathers overlooked, in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, the inseparable union of the divine Logos with the human nature, and assumed that the Logos enters into a union with the elements of bread and wine analogous with the incarnation, so that no reference was had whatever to the presence of the body that suffered, and of the blood that was shed, for our sins. I pronounce this whole representation to be utterly false. It is made up of pure misconceptions, and deserves here no farther respect. For its full refutation, as a deceitful tradition which ascribes to antiquity a doctrine, that would destroy the whole connection of the ancient christian faith, and that would annihilate in particular the most sacred article of this faith, the mystery of the incarnation, I may refer to my article on the Doctrine of Irenæus with regard to the Eucharist, published in Rudelbach's *Journal for Lutheran Theology* for the year 1841.

between the substance and its accidents; while the first is wholly changed, the last remain. The question however, What belongs to the accidents and what is to be counted as the substance of the bread and wine? is a mere school question, and let it be answered one way or another, the answer cannot with propriety be made an article of faith. In the explanation of what is to be included among accidents, particular Catholic theologians go so far, that one can scarcely see more how to distinguish their view in substance from the Lutheran, which stands to the simple proposition, that notwithstanding the real presence bread and wine remain what they are. We find that church fathers like Irenæus always look upon the consecrated bread and wine as still a corporal food, which for unprejudiced thinking implies certainly that the substance of them is not changed. But the Catholics set themselves right with all such representations, by reminding us that the virtue bread and wine have to nourish and strengthen the body is to be reckoned also among their accidents, in which view we have no right to think of transubstantiation as destroying any such property in the elements. When it once comes to this however, transubstantiation in itself considered (without regard to its consequences) can no longer be distinguished for the standpoint of faith from the real presence, and any deviation there may be in it from the sense of the Scriptures, to him who finds this presence in the Scriptures, will not seem to be of any serious account. This feeling has been openly expressed also once and again, in times following the Reformation, by Catholic as well as Lutheran divines. If there is any one among the last who deserves to be named as authority in exegetical matters, it will be allowed to be J. A. Bengel. This pious scholar declares, in one of his letters published by Burk, that he would much sooner undertake to prove transubstantiation from the Scriptures, than that view which acknowledges no real presence of Christ's body.

The difference between the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines would be indeed great, if the first pretended to say that the host is changed into a corresponding part of the Saviour's body, and so the wine also into a part of his blood. That apprehensions of this sort, bringing down the mystery into the sphere of common local existence and making it thus a phenomenon of sense, are actually at hand in the Catholic church, may be gathered from the exceptional cases, in which the show of the earthly accidents is reported as actually disappearing at times, so as to allow the sacred blood to be seen as such in the cup. The Catholic church would do well not to require faith in miracles.

of this sort; since it is associated with conceptions, that contradict her own better doctrine. For this supposes the glorification of Christ's body, and affirms its presence only, under such exalted form, laying particular stress on the thought that the whole Christ, *totus et integer Christus*, is present; under each of the two kinds (Conc. Trid. Sess. XIII, cap. 3, comp. *ibid*, canon 3).^a This doctrine is far removed from every Capernaitic view, and only in contradiction to it can any one encourage those miracles of the popular belief, or employ them as proofs for transubstantiation. We only see here again however, how the practice of this church departs from its theory, and perverts truths which this apprehends in a right way; and so long as the case remains thus, it is not to be expected of course that the doctrine of transubstantiation should find on our side generally that toleration to which as a mere theory it is properly entitled.

The decided stand of the old Protestantism against this doctrine, had regard mainly to the *consequences* that connect themselves with it. While we go on now to consider these, it will be proper to inquire at the same time how far they are right, who tell us that the same consequences, particularly the adoration of the host and the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, flow also from the real presence. This affirmation comes from two different sides; first from the rigidly Reformed, who just to avoid these consequences reject the real presence; and then from the Catholics, who press on the Lutherans the necessity of receiving, along with the real presence, the whole doctrine of which they take it to be a part. Among those who present the matter under this last view, Bossuet above all deserves to be named, on account especially of what he has written on the subject in his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*. (Comp. the sixth book §§. 20-42.)

According to the Catholic doctrine, the change takes place at the moment of consecration and in virtue of it. It exists independently of the distribution and participation of the supper; even after the completion of the whole solemnity, the host still remains the body of the Lord. This conception of a change subsisting for itself and fully independent of use, was carried

^a Every Capernaitic conception is already shut out by this, that according to the inviolably settled expression it must be believed: in sanctissimo eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter, corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum.—Sess. XIII, can. I. In every Catholic Catechism, this is taught with the same words.

out by the theologians of the middle ages with the strictest consequence, which did not shrink even, as is known, from raising and in part at least affirming the revolting question : an etiam a brutis animalibus sumatur corpus Christi ?

The first consequence of the view which takes the presence of Christ to be bound to the consecrated host, is the adoration of the host, not only in the moment of consecration or distribution, but also afterwards, when it is preserved and exhibited in the church for worship, or is carried to a sick person, or is borne in procession as on the festival of corpus-Christi.

These consequences Protestantism avoids, by referring the Saviour's promise, on which rests the belief of his presence, only to the dispensation and reception of the sacrament. For only for this end, and no other, was the ordinance instituted.

This Protestant doctrine then is commonly so fixed, as to admit the real presence only in the moment of participation. We find it so taken precisely by those Lutheran theologians of the present time, who on this ground lay down the rule that the christian should kneel in the moment of taking the communion, but in this moment alone.

We find nearly the same view already among the Waldensians. The proposition among others is ascribed to them : *quod conversio*—this they still held—*non fiat in manu sacerdotis sed in ore sumentis*. In the Calvinistic theory it follows of itself of course, that the presence which it acknowledges is linked to the moment of participation, with which the subjective ascent of the communicant to heaven and his spiritual union with Christ are taken to coincide. But this limitation is not so of course on the Lutheran standpoint. It is thus definitely uttered by Melancthon only ; never, to my knowledge, by Luther. It does not fit by any means the connection of the strict Lutheran view. This proceeds, and as I believe correctly, on the idea that the real presence has place in consequence of the administration of the sacrament in conformity with its institution. The one essential part of this administration is taken to be the consecration. Through this the promise of Christ, given once for all, assumes its special application to the elements in hand. The consecration takes place with the words of our Lord : " This is—not, This shall be—my body." Nothing is more natural, when we set out with these premises, than to assume that now the consecration at once also, according to the sound of the words, goes into effect, and is not a mere pre-intimation of what is to become true afterwards in the moment of distribution. This last restriction, to my mind at least, appears exceedingly arbitrary. If we

assume that the promise and the consecration are the efficient cause of the reality of the sacrament, and so far as I can see Luther does assume this, there is no reason at hand for disjoining the effect in time from the cause, and transposing it to a later moment. Luther retained for some time the elevation in connection with the act of blessing. But what meaning could this have for the people, if not to remind them that in virtue of the consecration Christ was already present?

I will not rest here in a mere historical observation. It is my own conviction, that we should put away, in the celebration of the mystery, this arbitrary restriction of it to the moment of distribution. When any of the wine is carelessly spilt, or when at the close of the solemnity what is left of the consecrated elements is allowed to go to common use, it gives the Catholics heavy and it seems to me just offence. It was not permitted to turn any part that was left of the paschal lamb, at the close of the festival, to common use; what remained must be burnt with fire during the same holy night. We also are bound—not to worship what is thus left—but still to preserve it from every sort of desecration.

According to Lutheran and Anglican rite, the christian kneels when he receives the sacrament. The Lutheran doctrine allows, that this signifies an adoration of the present Christ. Against the proposition of the Catholic church that Christ is to be worshipped in the eucharist, I would not know what to object if it had merely this meaning, that in the solemnity of the eucharist we should pray to him as there present. And to restrict this worship to the moment of the distribution of the sacrament, repressing it in the interval between the consecration and the distribution, is something to my judgment and to my feeling wholly without reason. The adoration at the moment of consecration is an observance of the ancient church, as we may learn from Chrysostom. To this observance I find nothing to object.

In taking the ground that the Protestant service might and should approach the ancient usage, I may seem to have made a very important concession to Catholicism. With so much the greater force apparently may it urge upon us its other consequences.

But from this very standpoint, these may and must be rather refused and disowned. In the first place, Protestantism has the holy scriptures and christian antiquity on its side, when it stands to the principle that our Lord instituted his sacrament for the use of the solemnity of which he gave the example, not that a part of it should be withdrawn from its proper destination, and

kept for worship whether in the church or in public procession. When the church notwithstanding makes such use of the host, it is a liberty not sanctioned by antiquity. True, this was not Protestant here either in its practice. The ancient church knew nothing of a communion for the sick as we now have it, when the minister at the bed of the dying, and in the family circle perhaps, goes through a full celebration of the supper. The ancient usage was rather, as is known, that from the bread consecrated at the public celebration in the church a portion was carried also by the deacons to the sick. Nay, it might be shown that even as early as the third century, the practice prevailed of preserving also a part of the consecrated bread, to be used by the dying in cases of subsequent need. But such preservation is still always for the purpose, not of adoration, but of actual use.

If it be contended now however, that it follows of itself that the host should be honored with worship also in the interval of its preservation, I must deny it. Where religious transactions are in question in regard to which the conscience needs to be well grounded, we are bound to exercise the greatest caution towards ourselves and towards the forms that offer themselves for our devotion, and to keep closely to the bounds that are prescribed to us by the pattern set before us in the scriptures and ecclesiastical antiquity. We can not, and dare not, allow to the church, the right of introducing new modes of worship, however plausible the conclusions on which they are made to rest. The church, in case even she might indulge individuals in any such form of worship, should never make it a law for all nor raise it into a test of orthodoxy.

While we oppose here the requisitions of the Catholic church, it does not follow that we must characterise the adoration of the host, in or out of the mass, as idolatry. We know how commonly this has been done among Protestants. Even the Heidelberg Catechism does not hesitate, to stigmatize the entire mass as "an accursed idolatry." But if I may speak out openly what I think in this matter, I must confess that I would wish to have no part in such invectives. I cannot rid myself of the impression, which was made upon me some time since by the word of one of our great poets: "Woe to him who calls a religious service idolatry, the object of which is Christ"—at least in the mind of the worshipper. One who has ever at all brought home to himself that the Catholic is convinced of the Redeemer's actual presence in what he thus honors, must shrink certainly from representations that identify such worship with heathenism. Just as little may its parallel be found in that less repre-

hensible form of idolatry, which Jeroboam introduced into Israel when he caused molten calves to be set up at Dan and Bethel, that Jehovah the God of Israel might be worshipped through them as images or symbols. Neither is the worship which was afterwards rendered to the brazen serpent, (Nehushtan,) once erected by Moses in the wilderness as a sign of salvation, to be drawn here into comparison. I know but one analogy that we may fairly bring from the Old Testament. Only in the place which the Lord should choose for his name to dwell there, were sacrifices to be offered. So it was commanded in the Mosaic law. Nevertheless the Israelites transgressed this restriction laid upon them by God, nearly at all times down to the first destruction of Jerusalem, and sacrificed not only in Jerusalem or Shiloh, but also on the high places. And this Samuel also did; who notwithstanding was a judge and prophet of the Lord. Although too he observed not the prescribed rule, he was not at once visited with condemnation, but stood under Divine indulgence. So is it also here. The worship of the host, as it has place in the Catholic church, transgresses the right bounds. No one who is better informed should take part in it. No one should be forced to it. Still, those who have not such better knowledge, and suppose themselves to be honoring Christ in this way, are to be regarded as under Divine indulgence.

In the known controversy, how far a Protestant also may participate in the kneeling before the sanctissimum of the Catholic church, two cases, in my opinion, should be distinguished. It is a general christian principle, that the reality and efficacy of a sacrament does not depend on the personal worthiness of the administrator; according to Protestant view he cannot even by a false intention vitiate the reality of the transaction. Hence then the solemnity of the mass must be acknowledged as a true celebration of the Lord's supper, and the presence of Christ in it firmly held. If this be so, a Protestant who sees no ground for restraining this presence to the moment of distribution, may feel himself spontaneously moved to kneel along with the rest at the time of consecration; he may not consider it right to give offence on this point to those with whom he worships. But what might prevent him from such compliance, and so from attendance on the mass altogether, would be the fact, that according to a very widely extended conventional view, kneeling at the mass is taken as a sign of going over to the Roman church or of agreement with its whole system of faith. It is quite another matter however, where Protestants are required to kneel also when the host is carried in procession or borne to the sick.

As a second consequence proceeding from the doctrine of transubstantiation, we turn our attention now to the *communion under one kind* and the *doctrine of concomitance*. Those two points are thus related. The communion of the laity, and of non-officiating priests, under one kind, gained prevalence in the western church first as a custom or usage. Afterwards the scholastic theology sought to justify this usage, as well as all other parts of the existing system. This was done by the proposition, that the whole Christ is present under each of the two kinds, that the presence of his body cannot be thought of without that of his blood and *vice versa*. The use is a matter of discipline. This theory is a matter of doctrine, and was raised into a dogma by the council of Trent. The use may be changed again by the church; the dogma however, by which it is justified, has been irrevocably pronounced.

Isolated cases of a communion under the species of bread alone, are to be found in antiquity. Here belongs the custom, already noticed, of conveying to the sick a portion of the consecrated bread.* Of a communication of the cup going along with such instances, no trace that I know of is on record. Still these occasions are to be regarded only as cases of necessity. When the cup is withdrawn here and there in the Oriental churches, it is also by such necessary exception, and not as rule and law. Only in the Western church has the withdrawal been raised to any such character, and this too at a time when the opposition to transubstantiation, as urged by Ratramn and Berengarius, was no longer heard. It goes to show the vast distance which had come to hold in the view of the middle ages, between the laity and the priest when officiating at the altar. But still this thought is by no means sufficient, to explain the rise of the usage. It grew mainly, no doubt, out of an extreme fear of profaning the sacred blood. The danger of profanation, by spilling, was much greater in handing the cup, than in the case of the host. Möhler refers the withdrawal of the cup also to a certain diffidence which the laity felt about using what was so

* When in the case of the holy supper thus, what had place originally only as a necessity for the sick came to be in the western church the reigning custom, namely communion under one kind, the fact forms a remarkable historical parallel with the course of things in regard to the rite of baptism. Anciently baptism was administered by aspersion only to the sick (*baptismus clinicorum*), but afterwards this became in the west the reigning mode. The oriental (Greek) church on the other hand has retained, as the communion in both kinds, so also the form of baptism by immersion.

sacred, in view of their own unworthiness; in which view it must be thought of as a voluntary measure on the part of the people themselves, rather than as imposed upon them by priestly pride. This is the most favorable derivation of the usage for the Catholic church, and altogether it is not historically improbable. But when it is brought forward in the way of apology, it should be remembered that such diffidence with regard to using the means of grace which Christ has provided for all believers, is in itself false and wrong. It is the same sort of diffidence, that led many in the ancient church to put off their baptism as long as possible, the same sort of diffidence that hinders the pious Catholic from admitting the witness of adoption which the Holy Ghost works in the consciousness of believers; it is the same humility that leads him to turn to the saints for help, rather than to the Saviour himself. The feeling of unworthiness is in itself good; but in all these cases it is misled, and lacks the illumination that is shed abroad in the heart by full confidence in the Saviour's grace.

Communion under one kind, the source of the great Hussite commotions after the decree of Constance, was an evil which it was confidently trusted would find its remedy from the council held at Trent. On this point, above all, the Protestants wished to have a hearing in the body. The council fell in with this wish. In the thirteenth session (11th Oct. 1551), after all beside, had been settled in relation to the eucharist as a sacrament, the decision of four articles, of which three referred to the withholding of the cup, was deferred till the arrival of the Protestant delegates, for whom also a safe conduct was ordered.* In the fifteenth session (25th Jan. 1552), and still later, after an almost ten years' interruption of the council, on the 4th of March 1562, the safe conduct was renewed. Finally in the twenty-first session (16th July 1562), the four articles were decided fully in the sense of the Catholic tradition, the first three thus against the Protestants. Only these two questions were still left: "Whether the reasons which led to the withdrawal of the cup continue so of force, that the use of it may on no ground be allowed

* These four articles were as follows: 1. An necessarium sit ad salutem, et divino jure praeceptum, ut singuli Christi fideles sub utraque specie ipsum venerabile sacramentum accipiant. (On this it was already decided at Constance, that it is not *required* to receive in both kinds.) 2. Num minus sumat qui sub altera quam qui sub utraque communicat. 3. An erraverit sancta mater ecclesia, laicos et non celebrantes sacerdotes sub panis tantum specie communicando. 4. An parvuli etiam communicandi sint.

to any?" and secondly: "If in any case there were reasons to allow the cup to a nation or kingdom, whether any, and if so what, particular conditions should go along with the grant?" The determination of both these points was reserved by the council for a later occasion. There was still hope thus, that the wish of the Emperor, Ferdinand I., would be regarded, and a main difficulty in the way of church union be removed. But these expectations also were disappointed, when the body resolved, at the close of its twenty second session (17th Sept. 1562), to leave both questions unsettled, and to refer the whole matter to the Pope: "decrevit (S. Synodus) integrum negotium ad sanctissimum dominum postrum esse referendum,—qui pro sua singulari prudentia id efficiat, quod utile reipublice Christianae, et salutare petentibus usum calicis fore judicaverit. To such melancholy conclusion came the whole transaction, which had been regarded with so much expectation."

The council pronounced an anathema on any one who should say, that the church was not moved by just grounds and reasons to establish communion only under the species of bread for the laity and non-officiating priests. But what these weighty and good grounds were, was not said. And the fact is, that if anything is not to be justified, it is the pernicious decree of Constance.

The church has changed the institution of Christ, and vindicated this change by theories that belong to the schools, and that can lay the ground for no article of faith. In the sphere of genuine church faith and life, questions like that concerning the concomitance ought not to be brought forward. It is enough here to know, how Christ instituted his supper.

We can allow indeed, nay we must do so after Luther's example, that the Catholic also receives a true eucharist. He finds himself, so long as his church forbids him the cup, in a state of necessity, similar to that of the dying in the ancient church. For that which men withhold from him, the Lord himself, can

* This *Decretum super petitione concessiois calicis* is purposely not placed along with the doctrinal decrees of the twenty second session, but after the *decretum de reformatione*, to intimate that the object of it belongs to the sphere of discipline.

* The Emperor, who well knew that any permission yet to be obtained from the Pope would not have the favorable effect, that was to be expected from a decision of the Council, said to some prelates who were present when he received information of this decree: "Gentlemen, I have done all that I could to save my people; now look to it in your turn, you who have most at stake in the matter."—Comp. Sarpi, *Hist. du Conc. de Trente*.

secure to him a compensation. . But this does not say, that the church, entrusted with the dispensation of the Divine mysteries, has the right to put her members in such necessity. Rather the law, as it still stands, is the heaviest and most just stone of offence. This precisely is the abuse, which as experience teaches brings the purpose of leaving the Catholic church with many to full ripeness, and in truth no other evil in it can well be said to furnish so fair occasion for this step.

So far as I know, the bishops have power in single cases, where the transition of a Catholic to Protestantism may be prevented by this and by no other means, to allow an individual the use of the cup. In the case of the *Maronites* and of the *United Greeks*, Rome allows regularly communion in both kinds, as well as the marriage of priests. The Pope has authority unquestionably to extend both allowances to other nations also, nay to the entire Roman communion. His not having done so since the council of Trent, cannot cut off every hope that a better time may still come. Möhler himself expresses hopes that look this way. It is not indeed christian, but as men now are it is still natural and easy to be explained, that favors are refused to enemies which would be granted to friends. If the Protestants could only assume a more peaceable attitude towards the Catholic church, the desire of the best men on the first side might possibly make an impression on the best men of the other side, which could not be made by the most urgent demands of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. With the present temper of the parties, and the tumultuary conduct of those Catholics who seek the restoration of the cup, there is but small prospect indeed of such a result; only when the relations of the world are brought to such a form, that all Christians may see where they have their true friends and proper allies, will there be room to look for an adjustment also of this difficulty. Till then we must persist, on our side, in a calm but still earnest and firm protest against the withdrawal of the cup.

Translated by J. W. N.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

IN an interesting letter of the Rev. Dr. Bacon, written recently from Lyons in France and published in the N. Y. "Independent" and the "American and Foreign Christian Union," we meet with the following passages referring to the present and past religious character of that ancient and venerable city.

"Before I left home I resolved that, if it were possible, I would visit Lyons in my travels, and see for myself what God has wrought there for the revival and advancement of true religion. That city, as you know, is the centre of a great and powerful organization for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith—an organization second only to the Propaganda at Rome in the extent of its missions and the amount of its resources. In that city, too, the Roman Catholic religion is more flourishing, with the indications of living zeal, and more deeply seated in the affections of the people, than in any other city on the continent of Europe. The fact, then, so often reported to us, that there a Protestant Evangelical Church has been gathered, and that in the midst of such a population evangelical labors have been crowned with signal success, is a fact which the Christian traveler may well turn aside to see."

"Ever since my childhood the name of Lyons has been associated in my thoughts, with the faith and patience of the saints who suffered there as witnesses for CHRIST in the second century. The story of the sufferings and constancy of Pothinus, Blandina, Perpetua, and others, is upon record in the epistle from the Christians of Lyons and Vienne, to their brethren in Asia Minor, with whom they appear to have been closely connected—a document which is familiar to the readers of Milner's Church History, and which is among the earliest and most authentic remains of Christian antiquity. It was an interesting thought that I was now for the first time upon ground that had been consecrated by the struggle of primitive Christianity, and watered with the blood of martyrs, some of whom had looked upon the faces of CHRIST's immediate followers. And now, among the 200,000 inhabitants of Lyons, are there any living remains of the Gospel for which the primitive martyrs suffered, and which gave them the victory? The archbishop of Lyons and Vienne is honored by the Roman Catholic Church as the successor of Pothinus and St. Irenæus; but how slight the resemblance between the pompous and showy worship now performed under the roof of that old cathedral, and the simple prayers and songs of the few disciples who were wont to meet here in some obscure chamber "with their bishops and deacons," sev-

enteen hundred years ago. Where are the successors of those primitive Christians?

"It was with such thoughts that I went forth on the morning of the LORD's day to find the Evangelical Chapel in the *Rue de l'Arbre Sec*. I looked in at the cathedral and at other churches, splendid with pictures and images, as I past by, and beheld their devotions; and it seemed to me that the city could hardly have been more given to idolatry in the palmy days of Pagan Rome, than it is at this day. In these magnificent structures the Christian traveler looks in vain for anything like what he has learned from the New Testament. The worship, instead of being offered exclusively and directly in CHRIST's name to the one living and true God, is offered to deified mortals, and chiefly to Mary, "the mother of God." Instead of being addressed only to an invisible God, who is a spirit, and who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, it is offered to images and pictures, (and those, for the most part, of no superior description,) and to dead men's bones. Not in such places, nor where such worship is offered, are we to look for the true succession from the apostles and primitive martyrs, the true Catholic Church, which is the body of CHRIST."

Dr. Bacon's letter is addressed to an Association of Benevolent Ladies in New Haven, whose contributions have gone for a number of years past, through the Foreign Evangelical Society, (now the Am. and For. Chr. Union,) towards the support of an evangelical missionary in Lyons. In that city, containing with its immediate environs at least 300,000 inhabitants—next to Paris, the most populous and influential city of France—the great centre of Papal influence—the truth, according to Dr. Baird, has made greater progress within the last twenty years than in any other city of the same country. "The work began in 1825, or even earlier, in the efforts of a pious Swiss Protestant shoemaker. In the humble apartment of this poor man little meetings were held for reading the Scriptures and prayer. It was at these meetings, we believe, that Mr. Moureton, the brave grenadier of Napoleon, (who was in the battle of Leipsic, and several others in the later years of the reign of that wonderful man,) was converted." There was of course a considerable body of Protestantism there before; but this unfortunately had ceased to be evangelical; like the Protestantism of France generally had glided into dead rationalistic formality. The church here noticed is a wholly new and independent movement. The pious grenadier, Mr. Moureton, in the capacity of a deacon and colporteur, has done much to promote it for a series of years by his labors among the laboring population of Lyons and its sub-

urbs. The Rev. Adolphe Monod, settled as one of the pastors of the regular Protestant church in 1829, was soon after "brought to the saving knowledge of Christ, and began to preach the true Gospel with great zeal and power;" the result of which was, that the worldly-minded consistory of the church took offence, and soon after deposed him from his office. In this way he became the head of the small evangelical interest just noticed, which now assumed the character of a separate church, and has since grown into its present importance. It is remarkable however, that this improved Protestantism has derived but little of its material from the ranks of the old Protestantism. "Mr. Monod soon found that the new church was to be increased not so much by bringing back the degenerate Protestants from their rationalism to the simplicity of the gospel, as by conversions from among the Roman Catholics. Thus his enterprise became from the outset a work of evangelism among the manufacturing population of the city and its crowded suburbs. Into that field of labor he entered with great zeal and great success. And when, on the removal of Mr. Monod to Paris a few years ago, he was succeeded by Mr. Fisch, the work went on with undiminished prosperity"—that is, the work of turning Catholics into a much better sort of Protestants than could be made generally from the Protestant body itself. Dr. Bacon describes the congregation as very plain, made up for the most part of common laboring people of the lower class, but still as much resembling in its intelligent appearance and simple worship what he had been accustomed to in Puritan America; so that he felt himself, stranger though he was, among brethren of the same household of faith. In the afternoon, he attended a meeting of the brotherhood for mutual conference and inquiry.

"It was held in a school-room, and very much resembled a Congregational church meeting in New England. There was however one obvious difference. Those brethren were not merely concerned with the working of a system defined and understood in all its details, and familiar to them from their childhood. With the New Testament in their hands, they were inquiring after principles and rules of church order; and the question which then chiefly occupied their attention, and seemed somewhat to divide their opinions, was whether the government of their church should be in part committed to a body of elders, or retained entire in the hands of the assembled brethren. As I listened to the discussion, I could not but admire the free and manly yet fraternal spirit in which it was conducted. And as I saw what a school for the development of various intellectual gifts as well as for the culture of Christian affec-

tion, that church had been under its simple democratic organization, I felt quite sure that those brethren, with all their confidence in their teachers, would not be easily persuaded to subvert a system to which they were already so greatly indebted, or to divest themselves of the right of freely debating and voting on all their interests and duties as a church."

The letter states, that there are now in the city and suburbs four chapels, in addition to the mother church, one with a distinct pastor the other three missionary preaching places—that four ministers, several evangelists and a number of colporteurs, are constantly employed—that the total number of communicants in 1850 was 440, while about 2500 persons were more or less directly connected with the evangelical community; whereupon the excellent and much respected writer concludes:

"I think that in these facts the ladies who formerly contributed to aid the good work at Lyons, will find evidence that their coöperation was not in vain. Rarely have I enjoyed anything more than I enjoyed my visit to that missionary and apostolical church. Nor do I know where to look for a more satisfactory representation of the ideal of primitive Christianity than may be found in the city which was made illustrious so long ago by the labors of Irenæus, and by the martyrdom of Pothinus and Blandina."

In reading this, we were reminded of certain notices of the same place, in somewhat similar style, from the pen of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, (then of Islington, but better known since as Bishop of Calcutta,) in his work entitled "*Travels on the Continent of Europe in the Summer of 1823;*" as also of certain parallel passages in the same work, relating to the early and later Christianity of the celebrated city of Milan. Take in the case of Lyons the following extracts:

"This morning I have visited St. Irenée, the site of the ancient city, though now only a suburb. I here visited the Roman baths at the Ursuline Monastery (formerly so, for all the monasteries and convents were abolished at the Revolution.) These baths consist of a series of numerous dark vaults, communicating with each other about twenty feet under ground; but no longer interesting, except from their antiquity. I then went to what was the garden of the Minimes, and saw the remains of the Roman Amphitheatre, where the early Christians were exposed to the wild beasts. This scene affected me extremely. The form of the Amphitheatre remains, after a lapse of sixteen or seventeen centuries. Some traces may be discovered of the rising seats of turf, and several dilapidated brick vaults seem to indicate the places where the wild beasts,

and perhaps the holy martyrs, were guarded. It is capable of holding an immense assemblage—perhaps 30 or 40,000 persons. A still more elevated range of seats, to which you ascend by decayed stone steps, seem to have been the place allotted for the magistrates and regulators of the barbarous shows. A peaceful vineyard now flourishes where these scenes of horror once reigned. The tender garden shrub springs in the seats and vaults. The undisturbed wild flowers perfume the air. A stranger now and then visits the spot, and calmly inquires if that was the Amphitheatre which once filled all Christendom with lamentation. What a monster is persecution, whether Pagan, Popish, or Protestant! And yet, till the beginning of the last century, it was hardly banished from the general habits of Europe. Would to God that even now it could be said to be utterly rooted out!

“I visited, after this, the church of St. Irenée, built in the time of the Romans, when the liberty of public worship was refused the Christians. It is subterraneous, and contains the bones of the many thousand Christians who were martyred in the year 202, under the emperor Severus. It is of this noble army of martyrs that Milner gives such an affecting account. An inscription on the church states, that St. Pothinus was sent by Polycarp, and founded it; and was martyred under the emperor Antoninus; that St. Irenæus succeeded him, and converted an infinite multitude of Pagans, and suffered martyrdom, together with nineteen thousand Christians, besides women and children, in the year 202; and that in the year 470, the church was beautified. I have not an exact recollection of what Milner says, and therefore may be wrong in giving credit to some of these particulars; but I have a strong impression that the main facts agree with the tradition on the spot; and I confess, I beheld the scene with veneration. I could almost forgive the processions which are twice in the year made to this sacred place, if it were not for the excessive ignorance and superstition attending them.

“Near to this church are some fine remains of a Roman aqueduct, for conveying water to the city, built at the time of Julius Cæsar. A convent of three hundred nuns has arisen since the peace, in the same place, of the order of St. Michel, where many younger daughters are sent from the best families, to be got out of the way, just the same as under the ancient regime. In saying this, I do not forget that the education in many of the convents is, in some respects, excellent, and that the larger number of young persons are placed there merely for a few years for that purpose. Still the whole system is decidedly bad, and unfriendly to the highest purposes of a generous education.”

“Upon looking carefully into Milner's *Ecclesiastical History*, since I came home, I find there were two early persecutions of the

VOL. III.—NO. V.

Christians at Vienne and Lyons (neighboring French towns,) one about the year of our Lord 169, under the emperor Marcus Antoninus; the second under Septimus Severus, about the year 202. The first of these is best known, and the accounts in Milner refer to it. The scene of its cruel executions was the Amphitheatre which I visited as I have above mentioned. The second is not so credibly attested, but at the same time may on the whole be believed to have taken place. The church of St. Irenée relates exclusively to it. Pothinus was bishop of Lyons during the first cruelties; he had been a disciple of the blessed Polycarp, the contemporary of the apostle John. He perished about the year 169, being upwards of ninety years of age; he had been sent, in all probability, by Polycarp from Smyrna to found these French churches; for the merchants of Smyrna and Lyons were the chief navigators of the Mediterranean sea. This could not be very long before the persecution burst out. He was accompanied in his apostolical labors by Irenæus, an Asiatic Greek also, who wrote the interesting and authentic account of the first acts of the martyrs, preserved by Eusebius, and given so well by Milner. Irenæus succeeded Pothinus as bishop, and suffered martyrdom in the persecution of 202."

The animus of the writer in all this, the inward posture with which he looks upon the past and its relation to the present, comes out more clearly in the notice he takes of Milan and its distinguished prelates St. Ambrose and St. Charles Borromeo.

"*Sunday morning, Sept. 14.*—This is one of my melancholy Sundays. An immense Catholic town of one hundred and fifty thousand souls—the ecclesiastical apparatus enormous; about two hundred churches, eighty convents, and one hundred religious houses—compare this with the Protestant establishment of Birmingham or Manchester, which fall as far short of what such a crowded population fairly demands, as the Milan establishment exceeds it. We might surely learn something in England of the duty of greater zeal and attention to our pure form of Christianity, from the excessive diligence of the Catholics in their corrupt superstitions.

"I feel a peculiar veneration for Milan on two accounts: St. Ambrose, whom Milner dwells on with such commendations, was the light of this city in the fourth century; Carlo Borromeo, whose benevolence exceeds all description, was archbishop here in the sixteenth. This last I know at present little of; but Ambrose was one of the most humble and spiritual of the fathers of the church, two or three centuries before Popery, properly speaking, began. In this city Ambrose preached: it was here Austin heard him, attracted by the fame of his eloquence. It was here also, that Angilbertus, bishop of Milan in the ninth century, refused to own the

supremacy of the Pope ; indeed, the church of Milan did not submit to the Roman see till two hundred years afterwards. May God raise up another Ambrose to purify and recall the city and churches, which he instructed thirteen or fourteen centuries ago ! Nothing is impossible with God ; but Popery seems to infatuate this people. On the church of Milan notices are affixed, that whoever causes a mass to be said there, may deliver any one he chooses from purgatory. In the mean time, this debasing superstition goes hand in hand with secret infidelity and unblushing vice."

" St. Ambrose died in the year 397, in the 57th year of his age, and the 23d of his episcopate. He has been charged with leaning too much towards the incipient superstitions of his day, and thus unconsciously of helping forward the growth of monastic bondage and prelatical pride. Something of this charge may be true ; but he lived and died firm and unbending in all the fundamentals of divine truth. He loved the Saviour. He depended on his merits only for justification. He relied on the illumination and grace of the Holy Spirit. He delighted in communion with God. A rich unction of godliness rests on his writings ; and he was one of the most fervent, humble, laborious, and charitable of all Christian bishops."

" I have witnessed to-day, with grief and indignation, all the superstitions of Popery in their full triumph. In other towns, the neighborhood of Protestantism has been some check on the display of idolatry ; but here in Italy, where a Protesant is scarcely tolerated, except in the chapels of ambassadors, you see what things tend to ; Popery has its unimpeded course ; every thing follows the guidance and authority of the prevailing taste in religion.

" At half-past ten this morning we went to the cathedral, where seats were obtained for us in the gallery near the altar. We saw the whole of the proceedings at High Mass—priests almost without end—incense—singing—music—processions—perpetual changes of dress—four persons with mitres, whom the people called the little bishops—a crowd of people coming in and going out, and staring around them ; but not one prayer, nor one verse of the Holy Scriptures intelligible to the people, not even if they knew Latin ; nor one word of a sermon ; in short, it was nothing more nor less than a PAGAN SHOW.

" We returned to our inn, and, after our English service, we went to see the catechising. This was founded by Borromeo, in the sixteenth century, and is one of the peculiarities of the diocese of Milan. The children meet in classes of ten or twenty, drawn up between the pillars of the vast cathedral, and separated from each other by curtains ; the boys on one side, the girls on the other. In all the churches of the city there are classes also. Many

grown people were mingled with the children. A priest, and sometimes a layman, sat in the midst of each class, and seemed to be explaining familiarly the Christian religion. The sight was quite interesting. Tables for learning to write were placed in different recesses. The children were exceedingly attentive. At the door of each school, the words, *pax vobis*, peace be unto you, were inscribed on a board; the names of the scholars were also on boards. Each school had a small pulpit, with a green cloth in front, bearing the Borromean motto, *Humilitas*.

"Now what can, in itself, be more excellent than all this? But mark the corruption of Popery: these poor children are all made members of a fraternity, and purchase indulgences for their sins by coming to school. A brief of the Pope, dated 1609, affords a perpetual indulgence to the children in a sort of running lease of six thousand years, eight thousand years, &c., and these indulgences are applicable to the recovering of souls out of purgatory; the prayers also before school are full of error and idolatry. All this I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears; for I was curious to understand the bearings of these celebrated schools. Thus is the infant mind fettered and imprisoned.

"Still I do not doubt that much good may be done on the whole—the Catholic catechisms contain the foundation of the Christian religion, a general view of Scripture history, explanations of the creation and redemption of mankind, some good instructions on the moral law, sound statements on the divinity of Christ, and the Holy Trinity; some acknowledgments of the fall of man, and the necessity of the grace of God's Holy Spirit; with inculcations of repentance, contrition, humility, self-denial, watchfulness, and preparation for death and judgment. These catechisms are not brief summaries, but rather full explanations of religion; making up small volumes of fifty or more pages. In the frontispiece of the catechism for the diocese of Geneva is the following affecting sentence, under the figure of our Lord, "*Son amour et mon crime ont mis Jésus à mort*"—a sentiment which cannot but produce good. Still all is woefully mixed up with superstition, and error, and human traditions; and the consequence of this mixture is, that vital truths are so associated in the mind, from early youth, with the follies of Popery, that even the most pious men of that communion do not enough distinguish between them. If you deny transubstantiation, they suppose you disbelieve the divinity of Christ; if you avow that you are not a Papist, they suppose that you are a heretic, and have renounced the faith, &c. It was thus that such eminent Christians as Pascal, Nicole, Quesnel, Fénelon, and the great men of the Jansenist school, lived and died in the church of Rome. "A voluntary humility," as well as the "worshipping of angels,"—Coloss. ii. 18—may well be noted by St. Paul as an er-

ror, which ought zealously to be excluded from the Christian church."

"I was vexed on returning to Eng^land, and consulting my books, that I had been so long ignorant of the history and character of Borromeo. He is considered by the Roman Catholic writers as the model of all virtues, and the great restorer of ecclesiastical discipline in the sixteenth century. I have not been able to satisfy myself in what degree he was a true Christian, in the Scriptural sense of the word. That he was devoted to the superstitions of Popery, and was a firm upholder of the Roman see, cannot be doubted; but I have no access to his sermons or letters, so as to judge whether any living embers of the faith and love of Christ were smothered at the bottom of these superstitions. His habits of devotion, his self-denial, his zeal, his fortitude, his humility, and especially his unbounded and almost unparalleled benevolence, which are ascribed to him by universal consent, would lead one to hope that, notwithstanding "the wood, and hay, and stubble," accumulated on it, he was building on the true "foundation, Christ Jesus."—1 Cor. iii. 11, 12.

"He was born at Arona in 1538, in a small apartment which I saw behind the church; and was of one of the noblest and most opulent families of Italy. At the age of eleven he had several livings given him by his uncle the Cardinal de Medicis, who was elected Pope in 1549. In his twenty-third year he was created cardinal by the same pontiff, and managed the proceedings of the council of Trent, as well as the chief temporal affairs of the Pope, for some years. This I consider as by far the most unfavorable part of Borromeo's life, as to the cultivation of personal piety. Such employments at Rome must have initiated him into all the system of that artful and secular court—and he who was intrusted to draw up the Trent catechism, must at that time have had little real Christian knowledge or feeling. However, in 1565 he left Rome, and went to reside at Milan, of which he had been made archbishop.

"Here begins the bright part of Borromeo's history. He had now to preside over the largest diocese of Italy, consisting of not less than eight hundred and fifty parishes, many of them in the wildest regions of the Alps. He began by resigning all his other preferments, by giving up to his family his chief estates, and by dividing the revenues of his archbishopric into three parts—one for the poor—another for the building and reparation of churches—the third for his domestic expenditure as bishop; all the accounts of which he submitted annually to the examination of his clergy. He next totally renounced the splendor in which he had lived at Rome, reduced the number of his servants, forbade the use of silk garments in his palace, rendered his household a pattern of edifica-

tion, slept himself on boards, prolonged his watchings and prayers to a late hour of the night, wore an under dress coarse and common, and devoted himself to perpetual fasts and abstinences.

"He then entered on the task of restoring decayed discipline and order throughout his vast diocese. To this end he was indefatigable in visiting himself every parish under his care, held frequent ecclesiastical synods, and established a permanent council, which met monthly to inspect and regulate the conduct of the priests. In this manner his cotemporaries agree in asserting, that he removed various scandals which prevailed amongst all classes of the faithful, abolished many superstitious usages, and checked the ignorance and abuses of the secular and regular clergy.

"His fortitude in carrying through his reforms, notwithstanding the violent opposition which he met with from all quarters, deserves remark. On one occasion an assassin was hired, who shot at him, whilst kneeling in prayer, in the archiepiscopal palace. Borromeo, unmoved, continued his devotions; and, when he rose from his knees, the bullet, which had been aimed at his back, but had been caught in the lawn sleeves of his dress, fell at his feet.

"His charities were unbounded. He built ten colleges, five hospitals, and schools and public fountains without number. Besides this, he bestowed annually the sum of thirty thousand crowns on the poor; and in various cases of public distress in the course of his life, as much as two hundred thousand crowns more.

"In the meantime, his personal virtues, his lowliness, his self-command, his forgiveness of injuries, his temperance, his prudence, his sanctity, the consistency of his whole character, (I speak after his biographers, whose veracity, I believe, is not questioned,) gave him such weight, that he not only rendered his immense diocese a model of good order and discipline, after an anarchy of eighty years, during which its archbishops had not resided, but extended his influence over the neighboring dioceses, and pushed his regulations throughout a great part of France and Germany.

"Perhaps his conduct during a pestilence which raged for six months at Milan is amongst the actions of his life which may lead one the most to hope that this beneyolent and tender-hearted prelate was indeed animated with the fear and love of his Saviour. Nothing could restrain him from visiting his sick and dying flock, during the raging of this fatal malady; when his clergy entreated him to consult his own safety, he replied, that nothing more became a bishop than to face danger at the call of his duty. He was continually found in the most infected spots, administering consolation both to the bodies and souls of his perishing people; and he sold all the small remains of his ancient splendor, and even his bed, to give the produce to the distressed.

"The institution, or rather invention of Sunday schools, is again

a further evidence of something more than a superstitious state of heart. Nothing could be so novel as such institutions in the sixteenth century, and nothing so beneficial. When we recollect the public admiration which has rested on such schools in our own Protestant and enlightened country, though planned scarcely fifty years back, we may estimate the piety of mind, the vigor and penetration of judgment, which could lead a Catholic archbishop and cardinal to institute them two hundred years ago, and to place them on a footing which has continued to the present day. May I not add, that possibly some of the superstitious usages now attached to these schools may have grown up since the time of Borromeo. Certainly the indulgences which I saw were of the date of 1609, five-and-twenty years after his death; for the reader must be informed that, in the year 1584, this benevolent bishop fell a victim to fever caught in the mountainous parishes of his diocese, which he was visiting in his usual course.

"As a preacher he was most laborious. Though he had an impediment in his speech, and a difficulty in finding words to express readily his meaning, he overcame these hindrances, and preached most assiduously on Sundays and festivals at Milan. His biographers say, that the higher classes in the city were offended with him, and did not frequent his sermons; but that the common people flocked with eagerness to hear him. Perhaps something of what the Apostle calls "the offence of the cross," may be traced in this. It does not at all lessen my hope of Borromeo's piety, that the rich and great did not follow him.

"Such is a faint sketch of some of the chief events in the life of Charles Borromeo. My materials are scanty, especially as to the spiritual state of his heart and affections. It is for God only to judge on this subject: but charity rejoices to hope all things in such a case. I acknowledge that his simple and sublime motto, HUMILITAS, is very affecting to my mind. I trust it was the expression of his real character; and that his submission to the usurpations of the Romish church may have arisen from that faulty prostration of the understanding to human authority, which is so apt to engraft itself, under circumstances like those of Borromeo, on scriptural lowliness of spirit. Oh, if he had more fully studied and obeyed his Bible, and had read with honest candor the treatises of his great contemporaries, the reformers of Germany and Switzerland, he might, perhaps, have become the LUTHER or ZUINGLE, instead of, what he actually was, only the FENELON of Italy."

The reference made in the foregoing extract to *indulgences* shows the writer, with all his education, to be one of those who stick in the vulgar notion still of this doctrine, and in spite of all evidence to the contrary insist on forcing upon the Roman church an abomination here which she continually disowns.

The idea of an indulgence to commit sin, a license in form to do wrong, is a pure fiction got up by the seething brain of fanaticism to make Popery odious; and is just as little entitled to regard at best, as the charge brought against Presbyterians for instance of holding and teaching, that there are infants in hell not a span long. An indulgence has not even the force of a pardon for past sin, however repented of truly by the sinner. It is a wholly different conception, which we have no right to drag hither and thither to suit our own prejudice; but are bound in common honesty, if we must oppose it, to understand and handle at all events in the sense of its own system, and not in another sense.

One can hardly help feeling somewhat amused with the evident embarrassment, in which the good vicar of Islington finds himself with his facts. He has in his mind a certain scheme of religion, what he conceives to be the clear sense of the Gospel in regard to this great interest, which is at war with the whole idea he has formed of Romanism; to such an extent, that he feels bound to think of this last only as a system of unmitigated abominations, a wholesale apostacy from the truth, and such a tissue of foolery and impiety in the name of religion as can scarcely be reconciled with the opinion, that there are any pious persons at all within its communion. He finds it a great deal easier to admit the true godliness of ten "witnesses" opposing the church in the middle ages, even though it should be among such a sect as the Albigenses, than to be entirely satisfied with that of one only, quietly submitting to the authority of this church, believing in transubstantiation, and praying to saints and images, in its bosom. And still he is a good man, anxious to find his own ideal of evangelical piety as broadly as possible diffused in the history of the world, and cordially disposed to acknowledge and honor it wherever it comes in his way. With the instance of Ambrose, in the case before us, he can get along without any *very* serious difficulty, taking Milner's Church History for his guide, and holding fast always to the common Anglican theory of a marked distinction, between the Christianity of the first four or five centuries and that of the thousand years following. There are things hard to understand in the piety of Ambrose and Augustine, even as we have it portrayed to us in Milner; for which however an apology is found in the supposition, that standing as they did on the borders of the great apostacy which was to follow, they came accidentally here and there within the folds of its impending shadow, without still belonging to it properly in the substance of their faith. But the idea

of any similar exhibition of apostolical religion from the same see of Milan, under the full-blown Papacy and in open communion with its corruptions—and all this too in the middle of the sixteenth century, and in the person of one who had been employed to draw up the Roman Catechism for the Council of Trent—was altogether another matter, and something not provided for plainly in any way by our tourist's previous theory. The good account he hears of St. Borromeo perplexes him. He finds it impossible to unite in his mind the image of a truly holy archbishop, such as he is described to have been, with the mummerly and superstition of the modern Milan, (a city wholly given to idolatry,) which yet hardly could have been much better in the age of the Reformation, when presided over by this canonized man. Did he not hear the trumpet of the Reformation, giving no uncertain sound just over the Alps? And how then could he refuse to make common cause with it against Rome and the Pope? The bishop that was to be of Calcutta cannot understand it; but being, as we have said a good man, he makes it a point on his return home to look into the character of this same Borromeo, with such literary helps as he can find for this purpose; when, lo, to his own great surprise, not to say amiable confusion, it appears that there is no reason whatever to question the extraordinary sanctity of the man, so far as least as the outward show of consecration to works of piety is concerned. So the Rev. Daniel Wilson, in the exercise of that charity which hopeth all things and believeth all things, feels himself constrained to bear open testimony to its reality; the only question being still, whether the seeming sanctity after all had any proper root in the doctrine of justification by faith, the one great principle of religion in its true Protestant form. On this point a lingering doubt remains, which could be properly dissipated only by studying the character in question in the mirror of his own written thoughts; a privilege, which our author had not still enjoyed, when he first published his travels. Subsequently however it came in his way to look into the soul of the Catholic saint in this way; and now every doubt as to the genuineness of his piety was forced to retire; so that in the second edition of the same book, we have finally a free, full and altogether joyful acknowledgment of the fact, that in the person of Borromeo the Roman communion actually produced, so late as the 16th century, out of its own bosom and as it were in the very face of the Reformation itself, a veritable saint of like station and piety with the great St. Ambrose of the fourth century, and worthy even to be set in some sort of comparison with

the Protestant saints, Zuingli, Luther, and Calvin. Under huge incrustations of Popish superstition, may be clearly traced still, in this extraordinary case, the lineaments of a truly evangelical faith, an actual diamond of grace, formed no one can tell how in the very heart of what might seem to be most fully at war with its whole nature. The case is set down accordingly as a sort of grand exception to common history, the next thing to a *lusus naturæ* in the world of grace. Anselm, Bernard, Thomas a Kempis, Fenelon, and a few other like celebrities perhaps, names "*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*," are referred habitually to the same convenient category or rubric. They are apiritual curiosities, which no one should be expected fully to understand or explain.

In all this, however, we have two utterly false conceptions at work in the mind of the vicar of Islington himself. In the first place, his estimate of the extent to which real piety has existed in the Catholic church, both before the Reformation and since, is in no sort of agreement with the truth. In the second place, his imagination that this piety is in no sense the proper product of the Catholic religion as such, but something violently exceptional rather to its natural course, is not a whit less visionary and unsound.

Both these notions, we know, enter largely into our common Protestant thinking. But this does not make them right. They form in conjunction a mere blind prejudice, which like every other prejudice of this sort is sure to prove hurtful, in the end, to the cause it seems to favor and serve. Of all styles of upholding Protestantism, we may say, that is absolutely the worst, which can see no sense or truth whatever in Catholicism, but holds itself bound to make it at every point as bad as possible, and to fight off with tooth and nail every word that may be spoken in its praise. Such wholesale and extreme pugnacity, may be very convenient; as it calls for no discrimination, it requires of course neither learning nor thought, but can be played off under all circumstances, by almost any polemic, with about the same good effect. Its strength consists mainly in calling nick-names, in repeating outrageous charges without regard to any contradiction from the other side, in thrumming over threadbare common-places received by tradition from the easy credulity of times past, in huge exaggerations, and vast distortions, and bold insulting insinuations thrown out at random in any and every direction.* But however convenient all this may be, re-

* As a single exemplification, take the *Ladies'* petition got up a few months

quiring little reading, and less thought, and no politeness nor charity whatever, it is high time to see that it is a system of tactics, which needs in truth only a slight change of circumstances at any time to work just the opposite way from that in which it is meant to work. The vanity and impotency of it must become apparent, in proportion precisely as men are brought to look at things with their own eyes; and then the result is, that sensible and well-bred people, not those who go by the text book of a sect, but such as move in a wider range of thought and have some better knowledge of the world, political and literary men, seeing how they have been imposed upon by the current slang, are very apt to be taken with a sort of quiet disgust towards the whole interest which they find to be thus badly defend-

since for the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia, under the auspices of the notorious Giustiniani, calling for the suppression of nunneries, under the gross insinuation of their being only seats of licentiousness and sin. Strange "ladies" they must have been, that could lend their names to such an infamous libel on the purity of their own sex. The like insult directed towards the Episcopalians, Methodists or Presbyterians, would have at once drawn upon itself the angry frown of society, as a breach of all decency as well as charity. But as directed against the Catholics only, the blackguardism of the thing was generally not felt. Certain evangelical papers caught up even with great gusto, as a capital hit, the flying report that the Legislature had referred the petition to the Committee on Vice and Immorality. Now if *any* ground had ever been given for scandal in the history of American nunneries, one might have some patience with such ribald ruffianism, hiding its malignity under the cloak of religion. But what well informed person needs to be told, that every apology of this sort is wanting? All attempts yet made to blast the good name of these institutions among us, have recoiled with signal discomfiture on the heads of those who have acted as leaders in the vile crusade. It is enough to refer to Charlestown, Pittsburg, and Montreal—to the *memory* of Miss Reed, Dr. Brownlee and Maria Monk. On the other hand, the good works of these religious houses have been too manifold and plain in every direction, to be at all rationally called in question. Now in all seriousness we ask, what right in these circumstances have people pretending to be themselves respectable and pious, to vilify and calumniate the inmates of such institutions in the way of which we now speak, as though they had forfeited all claim to the most ordinary courtesies of well bred life? Just as little right, we say confidently, as any gentleman has to outrage in the same way any Ladies' Seminary whatever that is to be found in the land.—This same Giustiniani is the apostle of German Catholicism, as it has been called, or Rongianism, in this country; whose *wonderful* success in founding churches in New York, Rochester, Buffalo and Philadelphia, has been duly trumpeted and glorified in times past by a part of our religious press; though the same papers have never considered it necessary to let us know, how completely the infidel sham has in each case run out since into clear smoke. He has now gone to Italy, we are told, to help set things right in that unfortunate part of the world.

ed, and so to look favorably in the same measure on the other side, as being at so many points plainly an injured and persecuted cause. To make our opposition to Romanism of any weight, the first condition would seem to be clearly that we should have made ourselves acquainted with it on its own ground, that we should have taken some pains to learn from the system itself what it means and wills. But of all that army of zealots, who hold themselves perfectly prepared to demolish it at a blow through the stage or press, how few are there probably who have ever felt it necessary to get their facts from other than the most common Protestant sources? Take indeed our ministers generally. Has one in fifty of them ever examined seriously a Catholic work of divinity, whether didactic, practical or historical? An ordinary anti-popery assault implies no preparation of this sort whatever; but rather a dogged purpose only, not to hear or believe a single word the Catholics say for themselves, while everything contrary to this is forced upon them from other quarters, as the voice and sense of their system. The sooner all such fanatical indecencies can be brought to an end, the better. They help not Protestantism, but serve only to involve it in reproach.

To return to the two imaginations already named. It is a sheer prejudice to suppose, in the first place, that cases of sanctity and true godliness have been, or are now, of only rare and extraordinary occurrence in the Roman communion. Any one who is willing at all to look into the actual history of the church, to listen to its own voice, to study its institutions, to make himself acquainted with its works, will soon find reason enough to rejoice in a widely different and far more favorable view. The single institution of the "Sisters of Charity," with its manifold services of mercy and love, is of itself fact enough to upset, for any thoughtful mind, the vulgar idea that Romanism is without religion, and a source of evil only without any good. This is however but one among many illustrations looking the same way, which the charity, "that rejoiceth not in iniquity but in the truth," need never be at a loss to find in the same church. That must be a stout bigotry indeed, which is able to turn aside the force of all such examples, by resolving them into self-righteousness or mercenary motives of any still lower kind. It has its fit parallel only in the calumnies, that were used in the first ages to blacken the virtues of Christianity into crimes among the heathen.

But in the second place it is just as blind a prejudice again, to suppose that the piety of the Roman church, such as it is,

springs not from the proper life of the system itself, but is there rather by accident, and as something out of place, and so to speak in spite of the unfriendly connections with which it is surrounded; so that if it could only be torn up from the soil in which it thus happens to stand, and transplanted into a truly evangelical liberty, it might be expected to thrive and flourish at a much better rate. The native and as it were normal tendency of Catholicism, in the view of this prejudice, is not to piety at all, but only to superstition and sin; for it is taken to be a systematic conspiracy against the doctrines of grace from the beginning; and hence when we meet with the phenomenon of a truly evangelical spirit here and there in its communion, as in the case of Pascal or Fenelon, we are bound to see in it a wonderful exception to established law, and to admire so much the more the power of the evangelical principle, which is sufficient even in such untoward circumstances to bring to pass so great a miracle. No one however can study the subject to any extent for himself, without being led to see that the very reverse of all this is the truth. Catholicism is inwardly fitted for the production of its own forms of piety, and owes them to no foreign source or influence whatever. Its saints are not exotics, that pine after other climes and skies, but products of home growth, answerable in all respects to the conditions that surround them. To place them in other relations would be, not to advance, but to cripple their life. Borromeo was constitutionally a Catholic in his piety, and not a Protestant. The same may be said of Fenelon, of Philip de Neri, of Anselm and Bernard, of Ambrose, and of the old church fathers generally. The piety of all of them has a complexion, which is materially different from any that we meet with in the modern Protestant world. We mean not by this to call in question the reality of this last, or its high worth; all we wish to say is, that it is of another character and order, and that what we find of saintliness in the Roman church is strictly and legitimately from itself and not from abroad. To Protestantize it even in imagination, is to turn it into caricature and to eviscerate it at last of its very life. What could the early fathers do with themselves in New England? Such an institution as that of the Sisters of Charity can never be transferred to purely Protestant ground; as no such ground either could ever have given it birth. Attempts are made in our own time to furnish a Protestant version of the same idea, under what claims to be a higher and more evangelical form; for the purpose of supplying an evident want. But nothing of this sort will ever equal the original design, or be more indeed than a

weak and stunted copy of this on the most narrow and ephemeral scale. It is only in the bosom of ideas, principles and associations, which are Catholic distinctively and *not* Protestant, that charity of this sort finds itself perfectly at home. And just so it is with the piety of this church in general. It is fairly and truly native to the soil from which it springs. That church, with all its supposed errors and sins, has ever had power in its own way to produce a large amount of very lovely religion. If it has been the mother of abominations, it has been unquestionably the mother also of martyrs and saints. It is a sorry business to pretend to deny this, or to try to falsify the fact into the smallest possible dimensions, for the sake of some miserable pre-conception with which it will not agree. We do but belittle ourselves, when we resort to strategy so poor as that. To deal with Romanism to any purpose, we must get rid of the notion that it carries in it no truth, no grace, no principle of religious activity and life; that it is as bad as infidelity, if not a good deal worse;¹ that it lacks all the attributes of a church, and is

¹ We clip the following from an editorial of the *New York Observer*, called forth not long ago by a sermon which Archbishop Hughes preached on his return from Europe, as the paper sneeringly adds, "without the Cardinal's hat." It is curiously characteristic.

"The Tribune finds fault with Bishop Hughes, for resisting the progress of Socialism in Europe. Between Romanism and Socialism there is little to choose, so far as the moral improvement of the people is concerned. They are essentially Anti-Christian, and many wise and good men regard infidelity as the least evil of the two, when the choice must be between it and Popery. We have therefore regarded it as one of the phenomena of the times, worth observing and recording, that the leaders of the Romanizing and the Fourierite parties in this country, are now discussing the comparative worth of their two schemes, for the improvement of mankind. We regard them both with equal detestation, and in the controversy now in progress, are quite indifferent as to the issue."

The same editorial reproaches the sermon, in the beginning, with betraying a want of sympathy with the liberty spirit that is now at work in Europe. So in general our American anti-popery is ever ready to fall in with the revolutionary tendency abroad, as though it must necessarily be both patriotic and pious—needing only plenty of *Bibles* to tame the whirlwind and keep it right. And yet notoriously this movement is prevailingly irreligious, radical, socialistic and infidel, threatening the foundations of all government and society. So it is regarded by the Catholic church; which is powerfully resisting it, and forms at this time, we verily believe, a most necessary bulwark in the old world against its terrible progress. But this the *N. Y. Observer* denounces, as hostility to the cause of liberty and the rights of man; while it goes on the next moment to make Catholicism just as bad as Socialism itself. We have heard before of the same sentiment being uttered in high places. But it is for all this none the less a truly abominable sentiment, that must sooner or later quail before the frown of

purely a synagogue of Satan or a mere human confederacy, for worldly and unhallowed ends. One wing of the Presbyterian church has it is true openly committed itself to this bold position, in pronouncing what they stigmatize as *Romish* baptism to be without force—unchurching virtually thus the whole church as it stood at the birth of the Reformation and for at least twelve hundred years before, and making such men as Augustine and Chrysostom, as well as Luther and Calvin of a later day, to be no better than unbaptized heathens, so far as any idea of covenant or sacramental grace is concerned; for it is notorious, that the baptism in question goes back, with all its objectionable features, not only to the fourth century, but beyond that to the days of Cyprian even and Tertullian. But no such brutum fulmen as this can stand. All history laughs it to scorn. The vitality of Romanism at this very time, and the evidently growing confusion of Protestantism, all the world over, show it to be idle as the passing wind. It is no time, in the crisis to which things are now coming, to think of settling the question between Protestantism and Rome, in this extravagant and fanatical way. There must be honesty enough to see and own good on the side of this *hated* church, as well as a keen scent for its sores. Take it simply as it appears in our own country, struggling finally into full organization, after years of crushing difficulty and persecution; and need we say, that it has merit and respectability enough in a religious view to give it some right to the same sort of genteel respect at least, that is felt to be proper towards almost every sect besides? Is its hierarchy at this time

intelligent and good men. A few years since Dr. Hengstenberg of Berlin, whose zeal for Protestantism none can question who have any knowledge of the man, was heavily pressed on this very point by a party which made a merit of treating Romanism in the same way—Protestants of the rationalistic no-religion school, who were disposed to place religion in mere opposition and contradiction to the Catholic church. But he had courage to say to such spirit, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" and to proclaim to the world that there is no comparison to be thought of between Infidelity and Catholicism, and that when it comes to a war with the first, all our affections and sympathies are bound to go joyfully with the last, as one grand division simply of the great army of faith to which all true Protestants as well as all true Catholics belong. The heartless fanaticism of the N. Y. Observer not only *infidelizes* such men as Bishops Cheverux, England, Eccleston, Hughes, Kenrick, &c., (any of them good enough to compare with the Rev. Sydney E. Morse & Co., any day,) and Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Charity, &c., in large number, in our own time; but goes away back to other times also, and swamps all the fathers and martyrs, after the first two centuries at least, in the same Acherontian lake.

a whit behind that of the Episcopal church, in point of learning, piety, or official diligence and zeal? Has any church among us produced better specimens of apostolical sanctity, than the first bishop of Boston for instance or the first bishop of Charleston, and others also that might easily be named; men, whose virtues adorn the history of the country, and whose parallels are not so readily offered in other communions, that we can afford for this reason to pass their memory into ungrateful oblivion. It is not easy to read the writings of Bishop England, glowing with the eloquence of noble gentlemanly feeling as they do on almost every page, and not be filled with indignation, as well as moved even to tears at times, with the gross and cruel wrong which has been heaped upon the Catholics among us from the beginning, in the holy name of religion. What *right*, we ask again, have the zealots of other churches, to lay aside here the laws of common courtesy, and to be just as rude and scurrilous as they please? What right have rabid pens, or still more rabid tongues, to make religion in this form the synonyme of impiety and unbelief, and when confronted with clear proofs and living examples of the contrary, to resolve all into hypocrisy, or happy inconsistency, as though it were not possible for piety to grow forth in any way from such a system? Some go so far as to tell us even, that no intelligent priest or layman in the Catholic church can seriously believe what he professes to believe. This however is such unmannerly rudeness as deserves no answer, come from what quarter it may.

But what we have in view now more particularly, is to expose the fallacy that lies in the extracts we have given from Dr. Bacon and Bishop Wilson, with regard to the nature of early Christianity, as compared with that particular modern scheme of religion, which they dignify with the title *Evangelical*, and which is for each of them the only true and perfect sense of the Gospel. Both writers assume, that there existed in the beginning, back of the corruptions and abuses of Romanism, and subsequently to the time of the Apostles, a certain golden age, longer or shorter, of comparatively pure religious faith, which truly represented still the simplicity and spirituality of the proper divine model of the church, as we have it plainly exhibited to us in the New Testament; and that this was in all material respects of one character precisely with what they now approve as the best style of Protestantism. But never was there a more perfect mistake.

It may be easy enough to show, that there are many points of difference between early Christianity and Romanism, as we find

this established in later times. But this fact is by no means sufficient to show, that the first was to the same extent in agreement with modern Protestantism, whether in the Episcopalian or in the Congregational form. It is clear on the contrary, that no such agreement has ever had place, but that modern Protestantism is still farther away from this older faith than the system by which it is supposed to have been supplanted in the middle ages. No defence of Protestantism can well be more insufficient and unsound, than that by which it is set forth as a pure *restitution* simply of what Christianity was at the beginning, either in the fourth century, or the third, or the second. It will always be found on examination to have no such character in fact; and every attempt to force upon the world any imagination of the sort, in favor of either Episcopacy, or Presbyterianism, or Independency, in favor of all or of any one of the three score and ten sects which at this time follow the Bible as their sole rule of faith, must only serve in the end by its palpable falsehood to bring suspicion and doubt on the whole cause which is thus badly upheld. Whatever differences there may be between the first ages and those that followed, it is still plain enough that the course of things was from the very start *towards* that order at least, which afterwards prevailed; that this later order therefore stands bound by true historical connection with what went before; and that Protestantism accordingly, as a still more advanced period in the general movement of history, holds a living relation to the first period only through the medium of the second, and is just as little a copy of the one in form as it is of the other. This we sincerely believe is the only ground, on which may be set up any rational defence of the great revolution of the 16th century, (unsupported as it stands by miracles or inspiration,) in conjunction with a true faith in the Divine character of the church. It is the theory of historical development, which assumes the possibility and necessity of a transition on the part of the church through various stages of form, (as in all growth,) for the very purpose of bringing out more and more fully always the true inward sense of its life, which has been one and the same from the beginning. When Romanists refuse every such view, and insist that their whole system has been handed down from the time of the Apostles, it *seems* not easy certainly to admit the pretence. But when Protestants also refuse the view, and pretend to give us things, in their several by no means harmonious systems, just as they were in the first ages of the church, the pretension is still more glaringly rash and false. However it may be with Romanism, it is certain that

Protestantism can never make good its claims on any such ground. And yet it will not do, to give up all historical connection with the church as it first started, and as it stood afterwards for fifteen hundred years—at least not without an overwhelming *Thus saith the Lord* in the form of miracles. The only escape then is in the formula of the same and yet not the same, legitimate growth, historical development. If this cannot stand, if it be found at war with the true idea of a Divine revelation, we for our part must give up all faith in Protestantism, and bow as we best can to the authority of the Roman church; for an interest which resolves itself virtually into infidelity, as Protestantism under every other view in which it can be put seems to us to do clearly, has no right, as in the end also it can have no power, to stand

It needs but little knowledge of history certainly, to see that Christianity as it stood in the fourth century, and in the first part of the fifth, in the time of Jerome and Ambrose and Augustine, in the time of Chrysostom and Basil and the Gregories, was something very different from modern Protestantism, and that it bore in truth a very near resemblance in all material points to the later religion of the Roman church. This is most clear of course as regards full Puritanism, in the form it carries in New England; but it is equally true in fact of the Anglican system also, and this whether we take it in the low church or high church view. Episcopalians are indeed fond of making a great distinction, between the first four or five centuries and the ages that follow; telling us with much self-complacency, that the early church thus far was comparatively pure, that the Roman apostacy came in afterwards marring and blotting the fair face which things had before, and that the English church distinguished itself at the Reformation by its moderation and sound critical judgment, in discriminating here properly between the purity of the primitive faith and its subsequent adulterations. According to the most churchly view, the Reformation was for Anglicanism no revolution properly speaking at all, but the simple clearing away of some previous abuses, and a self-righting of the English church as a whole once more into its old habit and course. But this is altogether a most lame and desperate hypothesis. All history gives it the lie. The boasted discrimination of the English Protestantism vanishes into thin air, the moment we come to inquire into its actual origin and rise. Never was there a great movement, in which accident, caprice, and mere human passion, more clearly prevailed as factors, over the forces of calm judgment and sound reason. If under the pol-

itical auspices that ruled it, the system was indeed so fortunate as to hit the true mean in the way pretended, while all the Protestant world besides missed it, the advantage must be ascribed to its good luck far more than to its good judgment. The case however becomes still worse, when we look into the real nature of the advantage which is to be referred to this good luck. The main feature of it is episcopacy, with a king at the head of it instead of a pope. In virtue of this constitution, and some few peculiarities besides, Anglicanism piques itself on being a *jure divino* succession of the old English branch of the Church Catholic, while for want of such accidents other Protestant bodies, it is held, have no right to put in any similar claim. The charm lies in the notion of the episcopate, handed down by outward succession, as a sort of primary Divinely appointed mark and seal of the true church.

But what would such men as Cyprian, Ambrose, or Augustine, have thought of the glorification of the episcopate, with all that may go along with it in the English system besides, in any such outward style as this? They did indeed put a high value on episcopacy and some other things that Anglicanism contends for; but only as these interests were themselves comprehended in what they held to be a still wider and deeper system of truth. Episcopacy torn from the idea of that glorious unity, with which alone was felt to go the actual presence of Divine powers in the church, would have been for either of these fathers as perfectly powerless an institution for church ends, as any other scheme of government whatever. The plea then of falling back here to the ground of the first four or five centuries, is for the vindication even of this *accident* itself a false plea; for the episcopacy of that time, and its other points of agreement with modern Anglicanism, were mere circumstances in a wider scheme of thought, which this same Anglicanism disowns now as anti-christian and false. If it had a right to reform thus far, and might do so without losing its identity as a part of the church, no good reason can be shown why it had not as much right, if it saw proper, to reform still farther. The rupture with Catholicism is the grand point; over against which, the accident of retaining episcopacy, and some other fragments of the old system, dwindles into insignificance.

For in truth there is no return here to anything more than fragments of the early system, even in the dead view now mentioned. It is as pure a fiction as ever entered a good man's head, to dream as Bishop Wilson does that his favorite scheme of evangelical Episcopalianism prevailed in the fourth century;

and the case is not materially improved, by simply changing the dream into an Oxford or Tractarian shape. The whole idea of a marked chasm anywhere about the fifth century, dividing an older purer style of Christianity from the system that meets us in the middle ages, much as English episcopacy stands related to the papacy, is no better than a chimera; history is all against it; we might just as rationally pretend to fix any such dividing line in the eighth century or in the tenth.

According to Bishop Wilson, Ambrose was somewhat infected with the *incipient* superstitions of his day; but still "lived and died firm and unbending in all the fundamentals of divine truth;" by which is meant, that he looked to the merits of Christ for salvation, and built his religion on the doctrine of justification by faith, taking the Bible for his text book and guide, after the most approved evangelical fashion of the present time. "Ambrose was one of the most humble and spiritual of the fathers of the church," we are told, "two or three centuries before Popery properly speaking began." Even as late as the ninth century, the church of Milan is represented as still holding out against the claims of the Papacy; and not till two hundred years after that indeed, does the writer allow it to have submitted to the Roman see, and in this way to have been drawn fully and finally into the vortex of its corruptions. But if anything in the world can be said to be historically clear, it is the fact that with the close of the fourth century and the coming in of the fifth, the Primacy of the Roman See was admitted and acknowledged in all parts of the Christian world. This is granted by Barrow himself, in his great work on the Supremacy; though he tries to set aside the force of the fact, by resolving it into motives and reasons to suit his own cause. The promise of our Saviour to Peter, is always taken by the fathers in the sense that he was to be the centre of unity for the church, and in the language of Chrysostom to have the presidency of it throughout the whole earth. Ambrose and Augustine both recognise this distinction of Peter, over and over again, in the clearest and strongest terms. To be joined in communion with the see of Rome was in the view of this period to be in the bosom of the true church; to be out of that communion was to be in schism. It was not enough to be in union with any other bishop or body of bishops; the sacrament of unity was held to be of force only, as having regard to the church in its universal character; and this involved necessarily the idea of one universal centre, which by general consent was to be found in Rome only, and no where else.¹

¹ St. Ambrose relates in praise to his brother Satirus, that on reaching

Examples of the actual exercise of supreme power on the part of the Popes, in the fourth and fifth centuries, are so frequent and numerous, that nothing short of the most wilful obstinacy can pretend to treat them as of no account. In every great question of the time, whether rising in the East or in the West, all eyes show themselves every ready to turn towards the *cathe-dra Petri*, as the last resort for counsel and adjudication; all controversies, either in the way of appeal or complaint, or for the ratification of decisions given in other quarters, are made to come directly or indirectly in the end before this tribunal, and reach their final and conclusive settlement only through its intervention. The Popes, in these cases, take it for granted themselves, that the power which they exercise belongs to them of right, in virtue of the prerogative of their see; there is no appearance whatever of effort or of usurpation, in the part they allow themselves to act; it seems to fall to them as naturally, as the functions of a magistrate or judge in any case are felt to go along with the office to which they belong. And the whole world apparently regards the primacy, in the same way, as a thing of course, a matter fully settled and established in the constitution of the Christian church. We hear of no objection to it, no protest against it, as a new and daring presumption, or as a departure from the earlier order of Christianity.¹ The whole

shore after shipwreck, he was careful to inquire, whether the bishop of the place "agreed in faith with the Catholic bishops, that is with the Roman Church"—assuming communion with Rome thus to be a test of orthodoxy and catholicity.

¹ It is common to refer to the strong terms, in which St. Gregory the Great opposed the use of the title, "Universal Bishop," on the part of John the Faster, Bishop of Constantinople, as a proof that no similar character was then thought of in favor of the Roman see. But this is altogether too late, to be of the least historical force in any such view. The evidences of the acknowledgment of the primacy of Rome long before this on all sides, are too overwhelming a great deal to be for a moment disturbed, by the mere sound of what is here paraded as a contrary testimony. Gregory disliked the pretension of the title; it had for him a haughty sound, which fell not in with his sense of the respect that was due to other bishops. Even Peter, "the first member of the holy universal church, to whom the care of the whole church was committed," was to be regarded still as one among his brethren, and not as a single and exclusive head. In rejecting this title, Gregory certainly did not disclaim any superior authority in himself, as successor of Peter; for he himself affirmed the contrary in the most positive terms, and exercised in the most marked manner the powers of an actual ruler of the whole church. "Assuredly," says Mr. Allies in his attempt to uphold the Church of England, "if there was any Pontiff who, like St. Leo, held the most strong and deeply rooted convictions as to the

nature of the case implies, as strongly as any historical conditions and relations well could, that this precisely and no other order had been handed down from a time, beyond which no memory of man to the contrary then reached. So perfectly idle is the dream, that Popery, taken in the sense of an acknowledgment of the primacy of the Roman see, and of its right to be regarded as the centre of church unity, came in only some two or three centuries after the age of Ambrose, and was not fully admitted into Milan even before the eleventh century.

The idea of the primacy itself however, in the view now presented, was from the first but one necessary part of that general doctrine of the church, which the modern evangelical school is ever ready to denounce, as the introduction of Romanism and a complete falling away from the primitive scheme of faith. It implies of course episcopacy; but it implies also a great deal more. At the ground of it lies the conception of a truly Divine character belonging to the Church as a whole, and not to be separated from the attributes of unity and universality; the idea of the church thus as one, holy, and catholic; the idea of an actual continuation of Christ's presence and power in the church, according to the terms of the original apostolic commission; the idea of sacramental grace, the power of absolution, the working of miracles to the end of time, and a real communion of saints extending to the departed dead as well as to those still living on the earth. It is perfectly certain accordingly, that in the fourth and fifth centuries, all these and other naturally related conceptions, running very directly into the Roman corruptions as they are called of a later period, were in full operation and force; and this in no sporadic exceptional or accidental way merely, but with universal authority and as belonging to the inmost life and substance of the great mystery of Christianity. The fathers of this glorious period did indeed hold "all the fundamentals of divine truth," as Bishop Wilson is charitable enough to suppose; but they held them in no such order and view, as they are made to carry in the theory which Bishop Wilson would fain make to be the reigning sense of their faith, in spite of the "incipient superstitions" with which it was outwardly disfigured. We owe it to ourselves here to see and own the full truth. The

prerogatives of the Roman see, it was St. Gregory." His letters abound with admonitions, injunctions, threats, and decrees, directed to bishops in every part of the church, all of whom he treated as brethren whilst they were blameless; if they erred, admonishing them as a father; and punishing them as a judge when they proved delinquent.

religion of these fathers was not of the shape and type now usually known as evangelical, and paraded commonly as the best style of Protestantism. They knew nothing of the view which makes the Bible and Private Judgment the principle of Christianity or the only rule of faith. They took Christianity to be a supernatural system, propounded by the Saviour to his Apostles, and handed down from them as a living tradition (including the Bible) by the Church. The order of doctrine for them was the Apostles' Creed. They looked upon the sacraments as mysteries; taking baptism to be for the remission of sins, and seeing in the "tremendous sacrament of the altar" the real presence of the Redeemer's glorified body, and a new exhibition continually of the one sacrifice that takes away sin. All was reality, not merely shadow and type. They acknowledged the divine character of the Christian priesthood, the necessity of confession, the grace of ministerial absolution. They believed in purgatory, and considered it "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." They held that the intercession of saints is salutary for the living in the other world, as well as in the present; and they made it a part of their piety accordingly to seek the aid of departed saints, as well as of angels, by addressing to them direct invocations for this purpose. They counted it a part of their religion also to venerate and cherish the monuments and relics of departed saints and martyrs, and were firmly persuaded that miracles were often performed through the instrumentality of such relics, as well as on fit occasions also in other ways; for of the continuance of miracles in the church, they never dreamed of making any question. They set a high value on the merit of celibacy and voluntary poverty, chosen in the service of the kingdom of God; and both by doctrine and example did what they could to recommend the monastic life, as at once honorable to religion and eminently suited to promote the spiritual welfare of men. All these things too went together, in their view, as so many parts and constituents of a single religious system; and the only voices that ventured here and there to make them the subject of doubt or contradiction, as in the case of Aërius, Jovinian and Vigilantius, were quickly cried down from every side as absolutely heretical and profane.

In the bosom of this system stood, not outwardly and by accident only, but as true representatives of its very soul and life, such men as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim the Syrian, Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Ambrose, and

Augustine. They held the fundamentals certainly of the Gospel ; but they held them in connexion with a vast deal that modern evangelical Protestantism is in the habit of denouncing as the worst Roman corruption, and what is most stumbling of all they made it a fundamental point to hold the supposed better parts of their faith just in this bad connection and no other. The piety even of Ambrose and Augustine is steeped in what this modern school sets down as rank heathenish superstition. The slightest inspection of historical documents is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind of this fact. No one can read attentively even the Confessions of Augustine, the work in which Milner and others affect to find a full parallel to the *experience* of true religion in the modern unchurchly style, without being made to feel that there is no room in truth for any such imagination. The two orders of thought are materially different. The very *crisis* of conversion in the case of the African father, turns on the principle of absolute and unconditional submission to the supernatural authority of the *Church*, in a form that would be considered anything but evangelical with the Pietistic or Methodist tendency of the present time.

The ground taken here then by Bishop Wilson, and by the whole low church or no church so called evangelical interest, still bent on claiming some sort of genealogical affinity with the orthodoxy and piety of the fourth and fifth centuries, is clearly and palpably false. But how is it with Puseyism or Anglicanism in the high view, pretending to find in this early period its own pattern of Episcopacy, as distinguished from what it conceives to be those later innovations of the Papacy which it pompously conderans and rejects? Alas, the whole theory is brittle as glass, and falls to pieces with the first tap of the critic's hammer. Nothing can well be more arbitrary, than the way in which this system proceeds with church antiquity, choosing this feature and refusing that, just as it may happen to square or not square with the previously settled accident of its own constitution. It is stiff for the episcopate, without being able to see that the idea of its divine right rests from the start in a view of the church, which involves with equal force and often asserts the same necessity for the primacy. It builds a doctrine here and a practice there on the universal tradition of this classic time, this golden era of sound church feeling and faith ; but without any reason, other than its own pleasure and whim, thrusts out of the way other doctrines and practices embraced in the same universal tradition with even greater clearness and force. The whole hypothesis is untrue. There is no such chasm between this classic period

and the time following as it pretends, and least of all in the form of any such discrimination of doctrines and practices as it needs to prop up its own cause. The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were not Protestants of either the Anglican or the Puritan school. They would have felt themselves lost, and away from home altogether, in the arms of English Episcopalianism, as well as in the more bony and stern embrace of Scotch Presbyterianism.¹

New England Puritanism of course, as represented by Dr. Bacon, is quite-willing to admit the general truth of what has now been said in relation to the age of Ambrose and Augustine; though at times ready enough still to talk of these fathers and their fellows, as though it took them to be in the main of its own communion and faith. Much even that Episcopalian Protestantism finds to be good here, this more unchurchly system has no hesitation in treating as part and parcel of the "great apostacy," which so soon turned the whole truth of Christianity into a strange lie. The fourth century was miserably corrupt. Even the third carries in many respects a very questionable face. But still we are not to give up entirely the idea of a truly golden age, representing for a time at least, however short, the true original simplicity of the Gospel, as the same has been happily resuscitated once again in these last days, particularly among the churches of New England. In the second century somewhere, or even reaching over this a little here and there into the third, back of popery and prelacy, the theory ventures to assume what

¹ "Did St. Athanasius or St. Ambrose come suddenly to life, it cannot be doubted what communion they would mistake for their own. All surely will agree that these fathers, with whatever difference of opinion, whatever protests if we will, would find themselves more at home with such men as St. Bernard or St. Ignatius Loyola, or with the lonely priest in his lodgings, or the holy sisterhood of mercy, or the unlettered crowd before the altar, than with the rulers or the members of any other religious community. And may we not add, that were the two saints, who once sojourned, in exile or on embassy, at Treves, to come more northward still, and to travel until they reached another fair city, seated among groves, green meadows, and calm streams, the holy brothers would turn from many a high aisle and solemn cloister which they found there, and ask the way to some small chapel where mass was said in the populous alley or forlorn suburb? And, on the other hand, can any one who has but heard his name, and cursorily read his history, doubt for one instant how the people of England in turn, 'we, our princes, our priests, and our prophets,' Lords and Commons, Universities, Ecclesiastical Courts, marts of commerce, great towns, country parishes, would deal with Athanasius—Athanasius who spent his long years in fighting against kings for a theological term?"—*Newman, Essay on Development.*

all historical documents fail to make clear, the existence namely of a strictly evangelical church, founded on Protestant principles, (the Bible the only rule of doctrine, justification by faith, the clergy of one order, the people the fountain of all church power,) breathing a Protestant spirit, and carrying men to heaven without sacramental mummary or mysticism in the common sense Puritan way of the present time. So we have seen Dr. Bacon pleasing himself with the imagination, that the Christianity of Lyons in the second century, in the days of Pothinus and Irenæus, and of course also the faith and piety of the church generally in a still earlier part of the same century, in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, corresponded in all material respects with the modern ecclesiastical life of Connecticut and Massachusetts. Is there any more ground for this fancy, than can be urged in favor of the one we have just now dismissed? We believe not. It rests throughout on a mere hypothesis, which involves in the end a purely arbitrary construction of history, just as wild and bold, to our view, as any that has been offered to us, from a different standpoint, by Strauss or Baur. Into this part of the subject however, the limits necessarily imposed on us at present will not permit us to enter. We hope to be able to return to it, in a second article, some time hereafter.

J. W. N.

ZACHARIAS URSINUS.¹

AMONG the reformers of the second generation, the race of distinguished men, who, though themselves the children of the reformation, were yet in a certain sense joined with the proper original apostles of that great work, in carrying it out to its final settlement and conclusion, no one can be named who is more worthy of honorable recollection, than the learned and amiable author of the far-famed Heidelberg Catechism. In some re-

¹ In the preparation of this article, use has been made of the following works: ALTING'S *Historia de Ecclesiis Palatinis*; VAN ALFEN'S *Geschichte und Literatur des Heidelberg'schen Katechismus*; PLANCK'S *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*; BAYLE'S *Dict. hist. et crit. art. Ursin*; SEISEN'S *Geschichte der Reformation zu Heidelberg*; K. F. VIERORDT'S *Geschichte der Reformation im Grossherzogthum B. den*; EBRARD'S *Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl und seine Geschichte*. Reference may be made also to the writer's own work on the *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*.

spects, indeed, the authorship of this symbol must be referred, we know, to different hands. But in its main plan, and reigning spirit, it is the genial product, plainly, of a single mind, and to the end of time, accordingly, it will be known and revered as a monument, sacred to the memory of *Zacharias Ursinus*.

In one view we may say of the Catechism, that it forms the best history, and clearest picture of the man himself; for the materials of his biography, outwardly considered, are comparatively scanty, and of no very striking interest. He had neither taste nor talent for the field of outward adventure and exploit. His whole nature shrank rather from the arena of public life. In its noise and tumult, he took, comparatively speaking, but little part. The world in which he moved and acted mainly, was that of the spirit; and here, his proper home, was the sphere of religion. To understand his history and character, we need not so much to be familiar with the events of his life outwardly taken, as to know the principles and facts which go to make up its constitution in an inward view; and of this, we can have no more true or honorable representation, perhaps, than the likeness that is still preserved of him in his own Catechism. Here, most emphatically may it be said, that "he being dead, yet speaketh."

Ursinus was a native of Bresslau, the capital of Silesia. He was born on the 18th of July, in the year 1534, of respectable parents, whose circumstances, however, in a worldly view, appear to have been of the most common and moderate order. The proper family name was *Beer*, (Bear) which, according to the fashion of the learned world in that period, was exchanged subsequently, in his case, for the more sonorous corresponding Latin title, *Ursinus*. He discovered at a very early period, a more than usual talent and disposition for acquiring knowledge, and was sent in his sixteenth year accordingly, to Wittemberg, for the prosecution of his studies in the celebrated University of that place, then under the auspices mainly of the amiable and excellent Melancthon. Here he was supported, in part it seems, for a time at least, by foreign assistance, and particularly by an allowance from the Senate of his native city; while he was enabled soon to help himself also, in part, by a certain amount of service in teaching.

He remained in connection with this University, altogether, seven years, though not without some interruption. The breaking out of the plague in Wittemberg, was the occasion of his spending a winter, in company with Melancthon, at Torgaw; and for some other reason, the threatening aspect, perhaps, of the political heavens, he left the institution again in 1552, and

returned with honorable testimonials to the place of his birth. The year after, however, we find him back once more in his beloved Wittemberg, where his studies were continued now with great diligence and success, on to the year 1557.

During this period, his proficiency in the arts and sciences, was such as to win for him general approbation and favor. He is represented as excelling particularly in classical literature, philosophy and theology. He was considered besides, quite a master of poetry; and composed himself various productions in Latin and Greek verse, which were much admired. Along with all this intellectual culture too, went hand in hand a corresponding culture of the inner spiritual man, which formed the crowning grace of his education, and added new value to every gift besides. Naturally gentle, modest, amiable and sincere, these qualities were refined and improved still farther, by the power of religion, which was with him a matter of living sense and inward heart-felt experience, the deepest and most comprehensive habit of the soul. It speaks with special significance to his praise, that Melancthon, the ornament of the University, conceived a very high regard for his abilities and moral qualities, and continued on terms of intimate personal friendship with him to the end of his own life. The high opinion in which he held his pupil, is shown strikingly by the encyclical letter of recommendation which he placed in his hands, when he proposed, at the close of his course in Wittemberg, to go abroad for a time, on a tour of observation and acquaintance in other parts of the learned world as it then stood.

This sort of travel, which served to bring the young apprentice of letters into personal contact with foreign scholars, was considered in that age necessary in some sense to a finished theological training; and it shows the importance attached to it, as well as the honorable relation in which he stood to his native place, that the Senate of Bresslau saw proper, in the case of Ursinus, to provide for the expenses of his journey out of the public funds. It was on the ground of this municipal generosity mainly, that he felt himself bound subsequently, to devote his first professional labors to the service of this city.

Melancthon describes him, in his circular, as a young man of respectable extraction, endowed of God with a gift for poetry, of upright and gentle manners, deserving the love and praise of all good men. "He has lived in our Academy," he goes on to say, "about seven years, and has endeared himself to everybody of right feeling among us, by his sound erudition, and his earnest piety towards God." Then follows a notice of his pil-

grimage, undertaken to make himself acquainted with the wise and good in other lands ; who are affectionately asked, accordingly, to receive him in a spirit answerable to his learning and modesty.

Provided with this high recommendation, he accompanied Melancthon first to the memorable conference, held in 1557, at Worms, from which place he proceeded afterwards to Heidelberg, Strasburg, Basel, Lausanne and Geneva. This brought him into acquaintance with the leaders generally of the Reformed Church ; who seem to have been gained, in a short time, to as favorable a judgment of his character, as that just quoted from Melancthon himself. From Switzerland he passed, by Lyons and Orleans, to the city of Paris, where he spent some time perfecting himself in French and Hebrew. After this, we find him again in Switzerland, making himself at home, especially in Zurich, where he enjoyed the intimate confidence and friendship of Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Gessner and other distinguished men, then belonging to that place.

On his return to Wittenberg, he received a call (Sept., 1558) from the authorities of Bresslau, to take charge of its principal school, the Elizabethan Gymnasium.

Here his services gave great satisfaction. But it was not long before a difficulty rose, which brought this first settlement to an abrupt termination. This was nothing less than a charge against him of unsound faith in regard to the sacraments. It was a time when Lutheran Germany was passing into a general hurricane of excitement, under the progress of the second great sacramental war, which resulted in its rupture, finally, into two confessions. Ursinus was found to hold the Calvinistic view of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper, as distinguished from the high Lutheran doctrine of such men as Westphal and Tilemann Hesshuss. An alarm was raised accordingly, by the clergy of the place, on the subject of his orthodoxy. As in the case of the celebrated minister Hardenberg, of Bremen, so here one great ground of suspicion, was Melancthon's friendship and favor. It seemed to be taken for granted, by the zealots for high Lutheranism, that no one could be in close intimacy with Melancthon, who was not at bottom a Crypto-Calvinist. Ursinus published a small tract in his own justification, setting forth in clear and compact summary, his views of the sacramental presence. This was his first theological production. It exhibited what might be regarded as the Melancthonian doctrine of the eucharist, and was in fact approved and commended by Melancthon himself in terms of the highest praise. It did not serve,

however, to silence the spirit of persecution in Bresslau. The author was still held up to reproach as a *sacramentarian*. In these circumstances, he made up his mind in a short time to withdraw. The magistracy would gladly have retained him, in spite of the industrious clamor of his enemies. But he had a strong constitutional aversion to all strife and commotion; and he retired accordingly, with an honorable dismissal, a voluntary martyr to the holy cause of peace, to seek a more quiet sphere of action in some different quarter.

When asked by a friend at this time, whither he would now go, his reply was in keeping with the union of gentleness and firmness, that entered so largely into his character. "I am well content to quit my country," he said, "when it will not tolerate the confession of truth which I cannot with a good conscience renounce. Were my excellent preceptor, Philip, still alive, I would betake myself to no one else than him. As he is dead, however, my mind is made up to turn to the Zurichers, who are in no great credit here, indeed, but whose fame stands so high with other churches, that it cannot be obscured by our preachers. They are pious, learned, great men, in whose society I am disposed, henceforth, to spend my life. As regards the rest, God will provide."

He reached Zurich on the 3d of October, 1560, and devoted the following winter here, to the active prosecution of his studies; under the guidance, more particularly, as it would seem, of the distinguished theologian, Peter Martyr. His relations to this learned and excellent man were in some respects of the same kind, with those in which he had stood previously with Melancthon. Among all the Swiss reformers, there was no one to whom he attached himself so closely, or who exerted over him the same influence, as this may be traced still in his subsequent writings. So far as the Reformed complexion is found to prevail directly in Ursinus, the pupil of Melancthon, the modification is to be referred mainly to Peter Martyr.

In the mean time God was preparing a proper theatre for his activity in the Church of the Palatinate, for which, also, his whole previous history and training might seem to have been designed and ordered, in the way of special Providence.

This interesting country, had hardly become well settled on the side of the Reformation, before it was thrown into violent commotion, in common with other parts of Germany, by the breaking out of the second sacramental war, to which we have already referred, as leading to the rupture of the two confessions. Out of this rupture, and in the midst of these storms of fierce

theological debate, grew the *German Reformed Church*, over against the cause of high Lutheranism, as this came to its natural completion finally, in the Form of Concord.

The great point at issue in the controversy, as it now stood, was the *mode* simply of Christ's mystical presence in the holy eucharist. The fact of a real communication with his true mediatorial life, the substance of his body and blood, was acknowledged in general terms on both sides. The rigid Lutheran party, however, were not satisfied with this. They insisted on a nearer definition of the manner in which the mystery must be regarded as having place; and contended in particular for the formula, "*In, with and under*," as indispensable to a complete expression of the Saviour's sacramental presence. He must be so comprehended in the elements, as to be received along with them by the *mouth*, on the part of all communicants, whether believers or unbelievers. It was for refusing to admit these extreme requisitions only, that the other party was branded with the epithet, "sacramentarian," and held up to malediction in every direction as the pest of society. The heresy of which it was judged to be guilty, stood simply in this, that the presence of Christ was held to be, after the theory of Calvin, not "*in, with and under*" the bread, but only *with* it; not for the mouth, but only for *faith*; not in the flesh, but only by the *spirit*, as the medium of a higher mode of existence; not for unbelievers, therefore, but only for *believers*. This was the nature of the question, that now kindled all Germany into conflagration. It respected altogether the mode or manner of Christ's substantial presence in the Lord's supper, not the awful fact of the mystery itself as always owned by the Christian Church.

The controversy soon reached the Palatinate. The city of Heidelberg especially, and its University, were thrown by it into complete confusion. It was in the midst of this tempestuous agitation, that the wise and excellent Prince Frederick the Third, surnamed the Pious, succeeded to the electorate. Under his auspices, as is generally known, the Reformed or Calvinistic tendency became established in the Palatinate. In the first place, the public quiet was restored by the dismissal of the two factious spirits, Hesshuss and Klebiz, who, as leaders on different sides, made the pulpit ring with intemperate strife, and were not to be silenced in any more gentle way. It was then felt necessary, in the next place, to have the subject of this controversy brought to some such settlement, if possible, as might preserve the peace of the country in time to come. The Elector conceived the design, accordingly, of establishing a rule of faith for

his dominions, which might serve as a common measure to compose and regulate the existing distraction. The Augsburg Confession, plainly, was not enough for this object ; for the point to be settled was mainly, in what sense that Confession was to be taken on the question here in debate. Melancthon was consulted in the case, and one of the last acts he performed, is found in the celebrated *Response*, by which he gave his sanction to the general course proposed by the Elector Frederick ; although, of course, he could not be supposed to have in view the end to which the movement came finally, as a formal transition to the Reformed Church. Such, however, was in a little time the result. There was no violent revolution in this change. The reigning spirit of the University, and of the land, was already more Reformed than Lutheran. Some alterations were made in the forms of worship. In all new appointments, preference was given to Calvinistic divines, and several were called from abroad to occupy places of trust and power. Finally, the whole work may be said to have become complete by the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism.

Among the new appointments of which we have just spoken, no name deserves to be regarded as more important or conspicuous, than that of Zacharias Ursinus. The direct occasion of his call, appears to have been an invitation of the same kind addressed in the first place to his friend, Peter Martyr, which this last saw proper to decline on account of his advanced age, while he used his influence afterwards, to secure the situation for Ursinus. In this way he was brought to Heidelberg, A. D. 1561, where he became honorably settled as principal of the institution known as the "*Collegium Sapientiæ*," in the twenty-eighth year of his age.

The year following, he was promoted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity, which imposed on him the duty of delivering theological lectures in the University.

It soon became plain, that he was formed to be the ruling spirit of the new movement, which had commenced in the Church of the Palatinate. He gained completely the confidence of the Elector ; his learning and piety, and excellent judgment, secured for him the general respect of his colleagues ; and from all sides, the eyes of men were turned to him more and more, as the best representative and expounder of the cause in whose service he stood, and to whose defence he had cheerfully consecrated his life. In this way, with all the natural quietness of his character, we find him gradually placed in the very heart and centre of the great ecclesiastical struggle, in which he was

called to take part. His settlement at Heidelberg, continued till the death of his patron, Frederick, in 1576, a period of fifteen years. During this time, his labors were kept up with the most untiring constancy and diligence; the occasion and demand for them; being still in proportion to their generally acknowledged faithfulness and worth. His regular official services were extensive and heavy; the more especially so, as he could never consent to be loose or superficial in his preparations, but felt himself bound always to bestow on his lectures the most thorough and conscientious care. But in addition to all this, he was called upon continually, to conduct a large amount of other business, growing out of the public history of the times, and often of the most arduous and responsible kind. On every emergency, in which it became necessary to vindicate or support the Reformed faith, as it stood in the Palatinate, whether this was to be done in the name of the theological faculty of Heidelberg, or by the authority of the Elector, Ursinus was still looked to as the leading counsellor and spokesman of the transaction. With the high position, moreover, which the Church of the Palatinate very soon won, among the Churches generally of the same confession, associated as its distinctive genius and spirit were from the beginning with his name, the representative character now noticed took from year to year a still wider range, extending in time, we might almost say, like that of Calvin himself, to the entire Reformed communion. As the earlier chiefs of this faith were removed by death, there was no one who, by his personal connections, his extensive knowledge, his clear insight into the interior nature of the points in debate, and the admirable qualities of his spirit, could be said to be better fitted to represent the communion in any such general way; and there was no one probably, to whom in truth the confidence of all was so much disposed to turn, as the main prop and pillar, theologically, of the whole Reformed cause..

Among the public ecclesiastical services to which we have just referred, the first place belongs, of course, to the formation of the *Heidelberg Catechism*, which is to be regarded as in some sense, the foundation of his subsequent labors.

To this task he was appointed in 1562, by the Elector Frederick, in association with the distinguished theological professor and court-preacher, Caspar Olevianus. Each of them drew up separately, in the first place, his own scheme or sketch of what was supposed to be required, Olevianus in a popular tract on the Covenant of Grace, and Ursinus in a two-fold Catechism, the

larger for older persons, and the smaller one for children.¹ Out of these preliminary works was formed, in the first place, the Catechism as it now stands. It has been generally assumed from the first, that the principal agency in its production, is to be ascribed to Ursinus; and to be fully convinced of the correctness of this view, it is only necessary to compare the work itself with his larger and smaller Catechisms, previously composed, as well as with his writings upon it in the way of commentary and defence afterwards. Whatever use may have been made of foreign suggestion or help, it is sufficiently plain from the interior structure of the formulary itself, that it is no mechanical compilation, but the living product of a single mind;

¹Olevianus was a decided and strenuous disciple of Calvin. He had less learning than Ursinus, but was more practical and popular. He excelled as a preacher rather than as a professor. He had great influence with the Elector; and to him mainly the Reformed Church of the Palatinate was indebted for its organization and discipline, borrowed from the Calvinistic model. It was well that his activity went prevalingly in this direction, and that the Catechism was cast mainly in the mould of a different mind. At the same time it owes something no doubt to his theology. He laid great stress on the idea of the *Covenant of Grace*, as a key to the right understanding of religion, and in this respect may be regarded as the forerunner of Cocceius and Lampe, who afterwards brought the "covenant theology" so widely into fashion in the Reformed Church. His dying hours were full of lively confidence and joy. The last word he spoke, when asked whether he was sure of his own salvation, is said to have been, as he raised his feeble hand and brought it to his breast, "*Certissimus*."—This point of *assurance*, as an element of faith, was held to be an important distinction of Protestantism, over against the Catholic view of justification. Ursinus also insisted upon it with great emphasis; going so far as to say, in one case, that it is blasphemous and devilish to question the fact, and that if a man have not assurance of his salvation before leaving this world, he can never have it in the next. "Faith itself is this assurance, which is the beginning of eternal life. . . It makes my hair stand on end to hear it denied. . . Not for a hundred thousand worlds would I be so far from my Christ, as not to know certainly whether I were his or not. That is true heathenism and the very sill of hell." Hence the peculiar form which the definition of faith takes in the 21st Question of the Catechism. With Olevianus all terminated, as with Calvin, on God's absolute predestination, as the fountain of the covenant and so the principle of redemption. Ursinus was a believer too in predestination; he read over the whole Bible at one time, from beginning to end, just to satisfy himself on this point, and it remained a settled article for him ever after. But it was controuled practically by the Melancthonian or proper German habit previously established in his soul. He could not make the decree of election, which is by its very conception partial and abstract, to be the *principium* or root of the new creation. No such election accordingly appears in the Catechism. It moves in harmony with the old Apostles' Creed. It teaches (Quest. 37), not a limited, but a universal atonement, an incarnation for the race, not a Gnostic or Baptist phantasmagoria for only a part of it.

there is an inward unity, harmony, freshness and vitality, pervading it throughout, which show it to be, in this respect, a genuine work of art, the inspiration, in a certain sense, of one representing the life of many. And it is no less plain, we may say, that the one mind in which it has thus been moulded and cast, is that emphatically of Ursinus and of no one besides. The Catechism breathes his spirit, reflects his image, and speaks to us in the very tones of his voice, from the first page to the last.

It is well known, what widely extended favor this little work soon found in all parts of the Reformed Church. In every direction, it was welcomed as the best popular summary of religious doctrine, that had yet appeared on the side of this confession. Distinguished divines in other lands, united in bearing testimony to its merits. It was considered the glory of the Palatinate, to have presented it to the world. Some went so far, as to make it the fruit of a special and extraordinary influence of God's spirit, approaching even to inspiration. It rose rapidly into the character of a general symbol, answerable in such view to what Luther's Catechism had already become as a popular standard for the other confession. Far and wide, it became the basis on which systems of religious instruction were formed, by the most excellent and learned divines. In the course of time, commentaries, paraphrases, and courses of sermons, were written upon it almost without number. Few works have passed into as many different versions. It was translated into Hebrew, ancient and modern Greek, Latin, Low Dutch, Spanish, French, English, Italian, Bohemian, Polish, Hungarian, Arabic and Malay. In all this, we have at once an argument of its great worth. It must have been admirably adapted, to meet the wants of the Church at large, as well as admirably true to the inmost sense of its general life, to come in this way so easily and so soon to such wide reputation and credit. Originally a provincial interest merely, it yet grew rapidly into the character of a general or universal symbol; while other older Catechisms and Confessions of Faith, had force, at best, only for the particular countries that gave them birth. It was owned with applause, in Switzerland, France, England, Scotland and Holland, as well as by all who were favorably disposed towards the Reformed faith, in Germany itself. Nor was this praise transient, an ephemeral burst of applause, succeeded again by general indifference and neglect. On the contrary, the authority of the symbol grew with its age. It became for the Reformed body, as we have just seen, the counterpart in full of the similar text book held by the Lutheran body from the hand of Luther himself. In this character, we

find it quoted and appealed to on all sides, by both friends and foes. Such vast popularity, we say, of itself, implies vast merit. We may allow, indeed, that the terms in which some of the old divines have spoken of its excellence, are carried beyond due measure. But this general testimony of the whole Reformed Church in its favor, must ever be of force, to show that they had good reason to speak here with a certain amount of enthusiasm.

The fact of its wide spread and long-continued popularity, is important, also, in another view; it goes to show that the formulary was the product, truly and fully, of the religious life of the Reformed Church, in the full bloom of its historical development, as this was reached at the time when the work made its appearance. No creed or confession can be of genuine force, that has not this inwardly organic connection with the life it represents. This must go before the symbol, creating it for its own use. The creed so produced, may come to its utterance, indeed, in the first place, through the medium of a single mind; but the single mind, in such case, must ever be the organ and bearer of the general life in whose name it speaks; otherwise it will not be heard nor felt. Here is the proper criterion of any true Church confession, whether it be in the character of a liturgy, catechism or hymn-book. It must be the life of the Church itself, embodied through some proper organ, in such form of speech, as is at once recognized and responded to by the Church at large, as its own word. This relation between word and life, is happily exhibited in the case now under consideration. Though in one sense a private work, the formulary before us, was by no means the product of simply individual reflection, on the part either of one or of several. Ursinus, in the preparation of it, was the organ of a religious life, far more general and comprehensive than his own. It is the utterance of the Reformed faith, as this stood at the time, and found expression for itself through his person. The evidence of this, we have in the free, full response with which it was met, on the part of the Church, not only in the Palatinate, but also in other lands. It was, as though the entire Reformed Church heard, and joyfully recognized, her own voice in the Heidelberg Catechism. No product of mere private judgment, or private will, *could* have come thus into such universal favor.

The great merit which may be fairly inferred from this great reputation, is amply verified, when we come to consider the actual character of the work itself. The more it is carefully studied and examined, the more is it likely to be admired. Among all

Protestant symbols, whether of earlier or later date, we hold it to be decidedly the best. It is pervaded throughout, by a thoroughly scientific spirit, far beyond what is common in formularies of this sort. But its science is always earnestly and solemnly practical. It is doctrine apprehended and represented continually in the form of life. The construction of the whole, is uncommonly simple, beautiful and clear, while the freshness of a sacred religious feeling, breathes through its entire execution. It is for the heart, full as much as for the head. The pathos of a deep toned piety, flows like an under current, through all its teaching, from beginning to end. This serves to impart a peculiar character of dignity and force to its very style, which at times, with all its simplicity, becomes truly eloquent, and moves with a sort of priestly solemnity, which all are constrained to reverence and respect. Among its characteristic perfections, deserves to be noted particularly, its *catholic* spirit, and the rich *mystical* element, that is found to enter so largely into its composition. No other Reformed symbolical book can compare with it in these respects.

Its catholicity appears in its sympathy with the religious life of the old Catholic Church, in its care to avoid the thorny dialectic subtleties of Calvinism, in the preference it shows for the positive in religion as opposed to the merely negative and controversial, and in the broad and free character generally, which marks the tone of its instructions. Considering the temper of the times, and the relations out of which it grew, it is remarkably free from polemical and party prejudices. A fine illustration of the catholic, historical feeling now noticed, is found in the fact, that so large a part of the work is based directly upon the Apostles' Creed. It not only makes use of this as a text, but enters with evidently hearty interest and affection also, into its general spirit; with the sound, and most certainly right feeling, that no Protestant doctrine can ever be held in a safe form, which is not so held as to be in truth a living branch from the trunk of this primitive symbol in the consciousness of faith. We have to regret indeed always, the turn given (Q. 44) to the clause in the fourth article, *He descended into hell*; where the authority of Calvin is followed, in giving to the words a signification which is good in its own nature, but at the same time notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause itself. A great deal of offence too, as is generally known, has been taken with the unfortunate declaration, by which the Roman mass is denounced, at the close of the 80th Question, as being "nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus

Christ, and an accursed idolatry." But it should never be forgotten, that this harsh anathema, so foreign from the spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus, and from the reigning tone also of the Heidelberg Catechism, forms no part of the original work as published under the hand of Ursinus himself. It is wanting in the first edition; and was afterwards foisted in, only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast, we are told, for certain severe declarations the other way, which had been passed a short time before by the Council of Trent.¹

The mystical element of the Catechism, is closely connected with the catholic spirit, of which we have just spoken. It is that quality in religion, by which it goes beyond all simply logical or intellectual apprehension, and addresses itself directly to the soul, as something to be felt and believed even where it is too deep to be explained. The Bible abounds with such mysticism. It prevails, especially, in every page of the Apostle John. We find it largely in Luther. It has been often said, that the

¹ "Frederick by no means followed passively and blindly the counsel of his theologians; but the Reformed doctrine, and along with it the most determined dislike towards the Roman worship, and towards all that was still retained from it in the Lutheran church, were for him a matter of strong inward and personal religious conviction, which he well knew himself how to uphold and defend from his own diligent and careful study of the Scriptures. From these, particularly from the *Old Testament*, he deduced his duty, to tolerate no idolatry in his land, though it should be in never so mild and plausible a form. Hence in the *second* and *third* editions of the Heidelberg Catechism, the 80th Question, by his positive order alone, and against the counsel and will of its authors, was made to receive the addition, then highly offensive and dangerous: 'So that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry'; and he obstinately refused afterwards to give up the clause, in spite of all intimidations from the emperor and the empire set before him for the purpose."—*Goebel, Churches of the Rhine*, p. 386. The same writer, p. 391, attributes the few polemical bristles generally of the Catechism to the same zealous interference of the Elector, who had no hesitation about thrusting his hand in this way, where it seemed necessary, into what he considered emphatically his *own* work. He had, it seems, a truly theocratic sense of his vocation, to act as a nursing father to the church. When certain preachers afterwards fell into the Arian apostasy of Adam Neuser, (who subsequently turned Mohammedan and died at last an atheist in Constantinople,) and were convicted by the theological faculty of blasphemy, the jurists still hesitated about condemning them to capital punishment; but Frederick promptly took the matter into his own hands, with the remark, "that he had the Holy Ghost also in the business as a master and teacher of truth," deposing and banishing two of the offenders, and in the course of a few months actually depriving the Hollander Sylvanus of his head, by public execution in Heidelberg.

Reformed faith, as distinguished from the Catholic and the Lutheran, is unfriendly to this element, that it moves supremely in the sphere of the understanding, and so is ever prone to run into rationalism; and it must be confessed, that there is some show of reason for the serious charge. Zuingli's great fault, as well as his chief strength, lay in the clear intellectuality of his nature. Calvin had a deeper sense of the mystical, but at the same time a still vaster power of logic also, which made it very difficult for such sense to come steadily to its proper rights. His theory of the decrees, for instance, does violence continually to his theory of the sacraments. It is only in its last and best form, as we find this brought out in the German Palatinate, that the Reformed system can be said fairly to have surmounted the force of the objection now noticed. The Heidelberg Catechism has regard throughout, to the lawful claims of the understanding; its author was thoroughly versed in all the dialectic subtleties of the age, and an uncommonly fine logic, in truth, distinguishes its whole composition. But along with this runs, at the same time, a continual appeal to the interior sense of the soul, a sort of solemn undertone, sounding from the depths of the invisible world, which only an unction from the Holy One, can enable any fully to hear and understand. The words are often felt in this way, to mean much more than they logically express. The Catechism is no cold workmanship merely of the rationalizing intellect. It is full of feeling and faith. The joyousness of a fresh, simple, childlike trust, appears beautifully and touchingly interwoven with all its divinity. A rich vein of mysticism runs everywhere through its doctrinal statements. A strain of heavenly music seems to flow around us at all times, while we listen to its voice. It is moderate, gentle, soft, in one word, *Melancthonian*, in its whole cadence; the fit-echo and image thus, we may fairly suppose, of the quiet, though profoundly earnest soul of Ursinus himself.

It carries the palm, very decidedly, in our view, as we have before said, over all other Protestant symbols, whether formed before it or since.

But notwithstanding all that has now been said, the Catechism was received far and wide in Germany itself, at the time of its appearance, as a loud declaration of war; and became at once the signal for an angry, violent onset, in the way of contradiction and reproach, from all parts of the Lutheran Church. The high toned party which was now filling the whole empire with its alarm of heresy, could not be expected of course to tolerate patiently any religious formulary, that might be felt to fall short

at all of its own rigorous measure of orthodoxy. From this quarter, accordingly, the Catechism was assaulted, more fiercely than even from the Church of Rome itself. Its very moderation, indeed, seemed to magnify the front of its offence. Had there been more of the lion or tiger in its mien, and less of the lamb, its presence might have proved possibly less irritating to the polemical humor of the times. As it was, there was felt to be provocation in its very meekness. Its outward carriage was held to be deceitful and treacherous; and its heresy was counted all the worse, for being hard to find, and shy of coming to the light. The winds of strife were let loose upon it accordingly, from all points of the compass.

Not only the unity and quiet of the German Church, but the peace also of the German empire, seemed in the eyes of the high Lutheran party, to be brought into jeopardy, by the new Confession. It was held to be not only heresy in religion, but treason also in politics. Both the Elector and his theologians found their faith severely tried, by the general outcry which was raised at their expense. But they were men of faith, and they stood the trial nobly and well.

The attack was opened by Tilemann Hesshus and the celebrated Flaccius Illyricus, each of whom came out with an angry publication against the Calvinistic Catechism, as they called it, full of the most intolerant invective and abuse, and grossly misrepresenting at different points, the religious change which had taken place in the Palatinate. Among other calumnies, the new faith was charged with turning the Lord's Supper into a profane meal, with undervaluing the necessity of infant baptism, with iconomachy, and with an attempt to alter the decalogue in departing from the old order of its precepts. Other blasts of warning and alarm were soon heard, in much the same tone, from different quarters. Wirtemberg in particular, issued a solemn censure, drawn up by her two best divines, in which eighteen Questions of the Catechism were taxed with serious heresy, and no effort spared to bring into discredit especially its doctrine of the holy eucharist. It was necessary to meet this multitudinous outcry with a prompt and vigorous answer; and such an answer accordingly soon appeared, with all due solemnity, in the name of the united theological faculty of Heidelberg. The task of preparing it, however, fell on Ursinus, who showed himself at the same time well able to discharge the service in a truly efficient and becoming way. The honor of the Catechism was fully vindicated, and the effect of the whole controversy was only to render its authority in the Palatinate more firm than before.

Meanwhile the Elector was taken solemnly to account, in a more private way, by several of his brother princes, who seemed to think the whole empire scandalized by his unorthodox conduct. This led to the celebrated conference or debate of Maulbronn; in which the leading theologians of Wirtemberg and the Palatinate came together, for the purpose of bringing the whole difficulty, if possible, to a proper resolution and settlement. The Heidelberg divines, were not themselves in favor of the measure; apprehending more evil from it than good. But they allowed their objections to be over-ruled, not caring to show what might be construed in any quarter, into a want of confidence in their own cause. The conference took place in the month of April, 1564, and lasted we are told, a whole week, from the tenth day of the month to the sixteenth. Among the disputants from Heidelberg were the Professors, Bocquin, Olevianus and Ursinus. On the other side appeared Brentius, two of the Tübingen Professors, and other distinguished divines. The burden of the debate, however, was thrown mainly upon Ursinus in the one case, and wholly upon James Andreæ, the great and good chancellor of the University of Tübingen in the other.

The acts of this *colloquy of Maulbronn* are of the highest value for the history of the German Reformed Church, and serve at the same time to throw a most honorable light on the whole character of Ursinus. They furnish throughout a lively image of his keen penetration, his comprehensive science, and his clear doctrinal precision, as well as a brilliant exemplification of the firmness with which he adhered to his own convictions of truth and right. His distinctions and determinations, especially on the question of the *Ubiquity*, may be regarded as carrying with them a sort of truly classical authority for the Reformed theology in all subsequent times.

The colloquy itself, however, only led afterwards to new controversy. It ended with a compact, indeed, to abstain from public strife, but, unhappily, this was soon forgotten and broken. Both sides, as a matter of course, claimed the victory; and it was not long till an effort was made, on the part of the Wirtemberg divines, to establish this claim in their own favor, by publishing what they called an epitome of the debate in a form to suit themselves; placing the whole discussion, with no small ingenuity and address, in a light by no means fair or satisfactory to the other side. To meet this misrepresentation, the divines of the Palatinate published, in the first place, a copy in full of the proceedings of the colloquy from the official record made at the time; and then added a clear and distinct reply to the Wir-

temberg epitome, exposing what they conceived to be its grave offences against truth. This called forth, in the year 1565, the great "*Declaration and Confession of the Theologians of Tübingen on the Majesty of the Man Christ, and the Presence of his Body and Blood in the Holy Supper.*" Then came in reply again from the side of the Palatinate, in 1566, a "*Solid Refutation of the Sophisms and Cavils of the Wirtemberg Divines,*" designed to make clean ground once more of the whole field. The controversy was renewed and continued thus in its full strength; and the author of the Catechism was still required to hold a weapon for its defence in one hand, while he labored on its proper exposition with the other. Both services were well fulfilled.

Among his various apologetic tracts, the chief place is due to the *Exegesis verae doctrinae de Sacramentis et Eucharistia*, published in the name of the Heidelberg Faculty and by order of the Consistory, whose sanction gave it at the same time the force of a public confession. It was translated also into the vernacular tongue, and in a short time went through several editions. It is still a work of great interest and value, as it furnishes the most authentic interpretation, which is anywhere to be found, of the real sacramental doctrine of the Catechism, in the sense which it had in the beginning for Ursinus himself, as well as for the whole theological faculty of Heidelberg.

As just intimated, however, the business of such public apology and defence, by no means exhausted the labors of Ursinus in regard to this truly admirable symbol. The Catechism was fully enthroned in the Palatinate, from the beginning, as the rule and measure of the public faith. It was made the basis of theological instruction in the University. It was introduced into all the churches and schools, under a regulation which required the whole of it to be gone over in course, in the way of familiar repetition and explanation, once every year. A regular system of catechisation was established in the churches, to which the afternoon of every Lord's day was devoted, and which was so conducted, as to include grown persons as well as children. Ursinus, in his capacity of professor, accommodated himself also to the general rule, and made it a point to go over the text of the Catechism once a year with his theological lectures. This custom he is said to have kept up regularly, on to the year 1577. Notes of his lectures were taken down by the students, which were allowed soon after his death, at three different places, to make their appearance in print. As much injustice was done to him, however, by the defective character of these publications,

his particular friend and favorite disciple, David Pareus, who possessed besides all necessary qualifications for the task, was called upon to revise the whole, and to put the work into a form that should be more faithful to the name and spirit of its illustrious author. This service of duty and love could not have fallen into better hands, and no pains were spared now to render the publication complete. Under such properly authentic form, it appeared first in the year 1591, at Heidelberg, in four parts, each furnished with a separate preface by Pareus; since which time, it has gone through numerous editions, in different countries. The Heidelberg Catechism has been honored with an almost countless number of commentaries of later date; but this first one, derived from Ursinus himself through David Pareus, has been generally allowed to be the best that has been written. No other, at all events, can have the same weight as an exposition of its true meaning.

In the midst of other agitations in the year 1564, the plague broke out with great violence in Heidelberg, causing both the court and the university to consult their own safety by withdrawing for a time from the place. During this solemn recess, Ursinus wrote and published a small work on Preparation for Death. It appeared first in German, but was translated afterwards into Latin, in which form it is found in the general collection of his Works, under the title of *Pia Meditatio Mortis*.

In the year 1571, he received an urgent call to Lausanne, which he seems to have been somewhat inclined to accept, in view chiefly of the undue burden of his labors at Heidelberg, which was found to be greater than his physical constitution, naturally weak, could well support. To retain him in his place, the Elector allowed him to transfer a portion of his college service to an assistant.

His marriage with Margaret Frautwein followed the year after, and is represented as having added materially to his comfort and rest. He was at the time nearly forty years of age.

This domestic settlement, however, was not of long duration. With the death of his patron Fredemick, in October 1576, the whole religious state of the Palatinate fell once more into disorder. He was succeeded in the electorate by his eldest son, Louis, whose previous connections had inspired him with a strong zeal for Lutheranism, in full opposition to the entire course of his father. Before his death, the old prince had sought an interview with his son, wishing to bring him under an engagement, if possible, to respect his views in regard to the church, as expressed in his last will and testament. Louis, however,

thought proper to decline the interview, and subsequently showed no regard whatever to his father's directions. On the contrary, he made it his business, from the start, to turn all things into an entirely different train. The clergy, together with the mayor and citizens of Heidelberg, addressed a petition to him, praying for liberty of conscience, and offering one of the churches for the particular use of those who belonged to his confession. His brother, *Duke Casimir*, lent his intercession also, to sustain the request. But it answered no purpose; Louis declared that *his* conscience would not suffer him to receive the petition. The following year, accordingly, he came with his court to Heidelberg, dismissed the preachers, filled all places with Lutheran incumbents, caused a new church service to be introduced, and in one word, changed the public religion into quite another scheme and form. The more prominent theologians were soon compelled to leave their places; among whom of course, were the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, Olevianus and Ursinus.

Ursinus found an honorable refuge with Prince Casimir, second son of the late Elector, who exercised a small sovereignty of his own at Neustadt, and made it his business to succor and encourage there, as far as he could, the cause now persecuted by his Lutheran brother. The distinguished divine was constituted professor of theology in the Neustadt Gymnasium, which the prince now proposed to raise to the character of something like a substitute, for what the University of Heidelberg had been previously for the Reformed Church. The new institution, under the title of the *Casimirianum*, soon became quite important. It could hardly be otherwise, with such names as Ursinus, Jerome Zanchius, Francis Junius, Daniel Tossanus, John Piscator, in its theological faculty, and others of the like order in other departments. Here Ursinus continued to labor, true to the faith of his own dishonored Catechism, till the day of his death.

His last publication of any importance, was a work of some size, undertaken by order of Prince Casimir, and issued in the name of the Neustadt clergy, in 1591, in review and censure of the celebrated Form of Concord. This was executed with his usual ability, and did good service at the time to the cause of the Reformed Church.

The triumph of Lutheranism in the Palatinate, proved in the end to be short. Before the plan could be fully executed, by which it was proposed to extend the revolution of the capital over the entire province, Prince Louis died, in the midst of his days; and now at once the whole face of things was brought to

assume again a new aspect. The administration of the government fell into the hands of Duke Casimir, who soon after took measures to restore the Reformed faith to its former power and credit. As far as possible, the old professors were once more brought back to the University. The Casimirianum of Neustadt, saw itself shorn by degrees of its transient glory. The Form of Concord sank into disgrace, while its rival standard, the Heidelberg Catechism, rose gloriously into view again as the ecclesiastical banner of the Palatinate. In due time, the whole order of the church was restored as it had stood at the death of Frederick the Pious.

But there was one among the banished theologians of Neustadt, who did *not* return at this time with his colleagues, to the scene of his former labors. The author of the Catechism himself, the learned and pious Ursinus, was not permitted to have part in the triumph to which it was now advanced. His feeble constitution, which had been for some time sinking more and more, under the untiring labors of his profession, gave way finally altogether; and on the 6th of March, 1583, the very year in which Prince Casimir came into power, he was quietly translated to a higher and better world. The event took place in the 49th year of his age.

He was buried in the choir of the church at Neustadt, where his colleagues erected also a suitable monument to his memory. The inscription describes him as a sincere theologian, distinguished for resisting heresies on the person and supper of Christ, an acute philosopher, a prudent man, and an excellent instructor of youth. A funeral oration was pronounced on the occasion in Latin, by Francis Junius, which is still important for the picture it preserves of his mind and character. Its representations, of course, are somewhat rhetorical, and some allowance must be made for the colorings of friendship and grief; but after all proper abatement on this score, it is such a glowing eulogy, as coming from one so intimately familiar with the man, must be allowed to tell greatly to his praise.

His works were published collectively, some time after his death, in three folio volumes, by his friend and disciple David Pareus.

The leading traits of his character have been already brought into view in some measure, in the sketch now given of his life. An enduring witness of his theological learning, and of his intellectual abilities in general, is found in his works. The best monument of his virtues and moral merits is the influence he exerted while living, and the good name he left behind him

throughout the whole Reformed Church at his death, the odor of which has come down to our own time. He was at once a great and a good man.

He seems to have excelled as an academic lecturer. His friend, Francis Junius, speaks with high commendation also of his talent for preaching; but his own estimate of himself here was probably more sound, which led him to withdraw from the pulpit in a great measure, as not being his proper sphere. His style and manner were too didactic for its use. For the ends of the lecture room, however, they were all that could be desired. At once full, calm, methodical and clear, his mind flowed here without noise or pomp, in a continuously rich stream, both gentle and profound, that was felt to diffuse the most wholesome instruction on all sides. He spared no pains to prepare himself fully for his work, and laid himself out to serve as much as possible the wants of his pupils; throwing his soul with living interest into the task in hand, and encouraging them to do so too by presenting difficulties or asking questions at the close of each exercise; which it was his habit then, however, not to answer on the spot, but to hold in reserve for a well studied judgment on the following day.

His diligence seemed to have no bounds. Of this we have the best evidence in the vast amount of the labors and services he performed, in the course of his public life. His parsimony of time, always as gold to the true student, is illustrated by the inscription which he is said to have had in full view, for the benefit of all impertinent visitors, over the door of his study: "*Amice, quisquis huc venit, aut agito paucis, aut abi, aut me laborantem adjuva.*" That is, "Friend, entering here, be short, or go, or else assist me in my work."

This regard for time was with him a sense of duty, and flowed from the general feeling he had, that his powers and his talents were not his own, but belonged to his faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ, and that he had no right to divert them from his service. Altogether his conscientiousness was of the highest order. His funeral orator says of him, that he had never heard an idle word fall from his lips; so careful was he with the government of his thoughts and the regulation of his tongue. He may be said indeed to have fallen a martyr, in some sense, to his own faithfulness; for it was the hard service to which he put himself in the discharge of his professional engagements, that wore out his strength and brought him down finally to the grave.

The modesty and humility of the man were in full keeping with his general integrity, and contributed much to the pleasing

effect of his other virtues. His manners were perfectly unassuming, as his spirit also was free from everything that savored of pride or pretension. He seemed to court obscurity, rather than notoriety. Such of his works as appeared in his own lifetime, were published anonymously, or in the name of the Heidelberg faculty; while the greater part of them never saw the light at all in any such form, till after his death.

Altogether, as we have before seen, he was of a reserved, retiring nature; formed for meditation and self-communion; averse from all noise and strife; mystical as well as logical, and no less contemplative than intelligent and acute; a true heir in this respect to Melancthon's spirit, as well as a true follower of his faith. For theological controversy, though doomed to live in it all his days, he had just as little taste as his illustrious preceptor himself; and when forced to take part in it, one might say of him that scarce the smell of its usual fire was allowed to pass on his garments; so equal was he still, and calm and mild, in the conduct of his own cause, avoiding as far as possible all offensive personalities, and bending his whole force only to the actual merits of the question in debate. On the other hand, however, no one could be more decided and firm in this calm way, when it was necessary to withstand error or maintain truth. In this respect he was superior to Melancthon, less yielding and more steadily true to the chart and compass of his own creed.

He was charged by some with being sour and morose. But this was nothing more, probably, than the construction, which his reserved and earnest character naturally carried with it for those who were not able to sympathise with such a spirit, or who saw him only as it were from a distance and not near at hand. It is characteristic of such a soft and quiet nature, to be at the same time ardent, and excitable on occasions even to passion; and it is not unlikely, that in the case of Ursinus, this natural tendency may have been strengthened at times by the morbid habit of his body, disturbing and clouding the proper serenity of his mind. Francis Junius describes him as just the reverse of the charges now noticed, and as made up of self-forgetting condescension and kindness towards all who came in his way.

The same witness, than whom we could have no better, bears the most honorable testimony also to his habits of devotion and personal piety. Religion with him was not a theory merely, but a business of life. He walked with God, and showed himself thus a worthy follower of those who through faith and patience have entered into the rewards of his kingdom.

On the whole, we may say, it is a great honor for the German

Reformed Church to be represented in the beginning by so excellent a man ; and it is not going too far perhaps to add, that the type of his character has entered powerfully into the true historical spirit of this communion, as distinguished from all other branches of the same faith. Such is the prerogative of genius, and such its high and lofty commission in the world. It stamps its own image, for ages, on what it has power to create.

J. W. N.

§ WILLIARD'S URSINUS.—It is extensively known, that the Rev. George W. Williard, of Columbus, Ohio, has undertaken to bring out a new translation of the celebrated lectures of Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism, as published by David Pareus. The old English translation by Parry is out of date, and at the same time not easy to be obtained. From our general knowledge of Mr. Williard's ability, as well as from a very small specimen we have seen of the forthcoming work itself, we doubt not but his task will be found to be well performed. We are glad to learn, that the work is already nearly through the press and may be expected to make its appearance in the course of a few weeks. The enterprise deserves patronage and favor, and we trust it may not fail to meet in this way its proper reward. All branches of the Reformed Church ought to take an interest in it ; but especially may this be expected of the German Reformed Church, whose distinctive glory it is to have produced the Catechism, and to have in it the clearest mirror of its own life. To speak of the value of the Commentary itself would be superfluous. Its merits are universally acknowledged.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. VI.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Second Article.

THE general Puritan theory of Early Christianity may be reduced to the following propositions :

1st. That it started in the beginning under the same form substantially, both in doctrine and practice, which is now known and honored as Evangelical Protestantism without prelacy. The doctrine was orthodox, as distinguished from all heresies that are at war with the doctrines of the Trinity, human depravity, and the atonement. The principle of the Bible and private judgment lay at the bottom of the whole system. The worship was much in the modern style of Scotland or New England. So was it also with the government or polity of the churches. All was vastly rational and spiritual. Even Presbyterianism, according to the Congregationalists, was not yet born. The Baptists carry the nudity farther still. But all agree, that the church notions of later times were unknown. There was no papacy, no episcopacy, no priesthood, no liturgy, no thought of a supernatural virtue in baptism, no dream of anything like the mystery of the real presence in the awful sacrament of the altar. The primitive piety was quite of another order from all this. It was

neither hierarchical nor mystical, but ran in the channel rather of popular freedom, democratic right, and common sense.

2nd. That this happy state of things, established under the authority of the Apostles and in their time universally prevalent in the churches, was unfortunately of only very short duration. How long it lasted is by no means clear. After the destruction of Jerusalem, we have for a time almost no historical notices whatever that serve to reveal to us the actual condition of the church; and such testimony as we have, with the going out of the first century and the coming in of the second, have so questionable a look at certain points, that it is hard to know how far they are to be trusted anywhere. It became the policy of later times to corrupt and suppress documents. The theory thus is of necessity thrown here on presumption and hypothesis. Two broad facts for it however are settled and given; first, that the church started right in the beginning, and secondly, that on coming fully into view again in the third century it is found to be strangely wrong, fairly on the tide in truth of the prelatical system with its whole sea of corruptions and abominations. Between these dates then must be assumed an apostacy or fall, somewhat like that which turned our first parents out of paradise into the common world. When or how the doleful change took place, in the absence of all reliable historical evidence, can only be made out by conjecture; and here naturally the theory is subject in different hands to some variations. The Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist schemes or constructions, are not just the same. All however make the paradisiacal period of the church very short. It is hard to find even one whole century for it after the destruction of Jerusalem; though in a vague loose way it is common to speak of it, as reaching through the second century and some little distance perhaps into the third.

3d. That the change thus early commenced was in truth in full opposition to the original sense and design of Christianity, and involved in principle from the start the grand apostacy that afterwards became complete in the church of Rome, and which is graphically foretold in those passages of the New Testament that speak of antichrist, the mystical Babylon, and the man of sin. The Baptists include in this corruption more than the Congregationalists; and these again include in it more than the Presbyterians, taking Presbytery itself in fact, and that idea of the church which *once* went along with it, for the first stage of the downward progress; but as to what lies beyond this, the vast world of notions and practices namely that go to make up the prelatical system as we find it in full force in the days of Cyp-

rian, the whole Puritan body of course is but of one mind. It is throughout an usurpation only and an abuse, against the Bible, against apostolical and primitive example, against the entire genius and spirit of evangelical religion. It belongs to an order of thought and habit of life, which however countenanced by many good men in the beginning, must be regarded as constitutionally at variance with the first principles of the Gospel, as antichristian and worldly; the natural and only proper end of which, in the course of two or three centuries, was the complete failure of the church in its original form. It became the synagogue of Satan. Christianity went out in dismal eclipse for a thousand years, with only a few tapers, dimly burning here and there in vallies and corners, to keep up some faint remembrance of that glorious day-spring from on high with which it had visited the nations in the beginning.

4th. That the long night of this fearful captivity came to an end finally, through the great mercy of God, by the event of the Reformation; which was brought to pass by the diligent study of the Bible, the original codex of Christianity, under the awakening and guiding influence of the Holy Ghost, and consisted simply in a resuscitation of the life and doctrine of the primitive church, which had been so long buried beneath the corruptions of the great Roman apostacy. The Reformation, in this view, was not properly the historical product and continuation of the life of the church itself, or what was called the church, as it stood before. It was a revolutionary rebellion rather against this as something totally false and wrong, by which it was violently set aside to make room for a new order of things altogether. If it be asked, by what authority Luther and the other reformers undertook to bring in so vast a change, the answer is that they had the authority of the Bible. This and this only, is the religion of Protestants. Popery was antichrist; the Bible teaches plainly a different religion, which must have prevailed in the beginning, and which Popery had contrived to suppress; and what better right than this fact then could the reformers have or need, to fight against it, to overturn it as far as they were able, and to set up the religion of the Bible, the primitive evangelical religion, in its room and place? Such was their warrant, and such as far as it went their good and excellent work. It is not strange however, coming out of such thick darkness as they had in their rear, that they were not themselves able at once to see clearly all that needed to be done in this great restoration; to say nothing of such outward political limitations as they had to contend with for instance in England. Luther

stuck miserably in the mud of Romanism to the last. Even Calvin had his sacramental crotchets, and talks strangely at times of the church. Anglicanism remained out and out semi-popery. Hence the need of new reformation. This we have in Puritanism; which itself also has required some time to come to that perfection of Bible simplicity and truth, which it now happily presents in this country, especially in New England—and most of all, if we take their own word for it, in the wide communion of the Baptists. Here finally, after so long a sleep, the fair image of original Christianity, as it once gladdened the assemblies of the faithful in the days of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, and the blessed martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, has come forth as it were from the catacombs, to put to shame that frightful mask which has for so many centuries cheated the world in its name and stead. And what is better still, there is some ground now also to hope, since we have got into the middle of the nineteenth century and Anglo-Saxon mind is in a fair way to rule the world, that this second edition and experiment of a pure faith and true church will be more successful than the first; and that Christ will find it proper *now*, in these last days, to be with his church always, and to make good thus his own promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, as they might seem to have done before, till Shiloh come or to the end of the world.

Such in a general view, we say, is the Puritan theory of the past history of the church, and such is the relation in which it imagines Protestantism to stand to Primitive Christianity. The theory and the fancy we believe to be both together absolutely visionary and false. More than that, they are eminently suited to overthrow at last the credit of Protestantism itself, and along with this to upset all faith in Christianity as being really and truly such a revelation as it claims to be for the salvation of the world. Grant the premises of this wild hypothesis, and infidelity may proceed at once to draw its own conclusions with unanswerable force.

It is truly amazing, before looking at the facts of history at all, that the holders of the hypothesis are not troubled some by the very *prodigiousness* of the conceptions that enter into its composition. They appear to be quite easy and at home, for the most part, in the fabric of their peculiar historical system, as though it were the most natural and reasonable structure in the world; and yet never was fabric of this sort probably so put together, as to furnish by its very texture more just cause for anxiety and distrust. The theory, instead of being natural and

reasonable, is as much against nature and reason as can well be conceived. Let any thinking man put out of his mind the mere habit of looking at the past through the medium of the theory itself, so as to bring home to himself clearly in an abstract way the elements and combinations of which it is constructed, and he must feel surely that no scheme could well be, in an *a priori* view, less probable or worthy of trust. Every presumption is against it. If believed at all by the earnestly thoughtful, it can be only through stress of overwhelming evidence, making it a sin to doubt. The unthoughtful of course feel no such difficulty. Their faith is easy, just because it is hollow and blind.

Only look at the scheme in its own light. All previous history looked to the coming of Christ, and prepared the way for it, as the grand central fact of religion and so of the world's life. The Old Testament revelation, through thousands of years, made room for the magnificent and awful mystery. At length it came, the Fact of all facts, full of grace and truth, heralded by angels, surrounded with miracles, binding earth to heaven, and laying the foundations of a new creation of whose splendors and glories there should be no end. Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our justification. His apostles were solemnly commissioned to preach the gospel throughout the world. On the day of Pentecost, they were armed with supernatural power from on high for this purpose; and the history of the Christian Church was opened under a form, that carried in it the largest promise of universal victory and success in following time. With this promise corresponded in full the progress of the new cause, in the age of the apostles and for a short time afterwards. The Gospel was rapidly published throughout the Roman world. The ascended Redeemer at the right hand of God, made head over all things to the church, gave proof of his exaltation and power by causing his kingdom to spread and prevail, in the face of all opposition whether Jewish or Pagan. The whole course of things seemed to show clearly, that the powers of a higher world were at work in the glorious movement, and that it embodied in itself the will and counsel of heaven itself for the full accomplishment of the end towards which it reached. It is usual indeed to make this early success of Christianity one of the external proofs of its divine origin, a real supernatural seal of its truth, like that of miracles. One would naturally suppose, that such a beginning must have led to some sound and true result, in harmony with its own heavenly conditions. But, according to the hypothesis now before us, the very opposite of this took place. Hardly

had the last of the apostles gone to heaven, before signs of apostacy began to show themselves in the bosom of the infant church, threatening to overthrow and defeat entirely its original design. In the midst of its early triumphs, whilst it had still strength to perform miracles and exhibit martyrdoms on all sides in favor of the truth, the leaven of this malignant corruption went forward, strangely enough, in the most active and virulent way ; infecting and poisoning, more and more, the very vitals of the church ; till in the course of a single century from the death of St. John, perhaps indeed much sooner, the entire course of its life was changed from what it had been at first, and turned into a false direction. Traces of the original faith and piety are still to be found indeed in the third and fourth and fifth centuries, the echoes and reminiscences as it were, more and more faint, of the better age which had gone before ; but these were exceptional now to the central tendency, rather than its true and genuine fruit ; the power that prevailed, and that was fast carrying all things its own way, almost without question or protest, was the "mystery of iniquity," that same great anti-christian apostacy in principle and drift, which in due time afterwards culminated in the Pope, and brought upon the world the darkness of the middle ages. The eclipse came not at once in its full strength ; but still, from the very start, it was the beginning of the total obscurity that followed, and looked to this steadily as its end. So in truth Satan in the end fairly prevailed over Christ. The church fell, not partially and transiently only, but universally, in its collective and corporate character, with an apostacy that was to reach through twelve hundred years. Had it not been for some copies of the Bible here and there, in the hands of a few obscure and persecuted witnesses for the truth, the light of Christianity would have become absolutely extinct ; for the so called catholic church, in league plainly with the powers of hell, and with the sovereignty of the world in its hands, showed itself bent for ages on the accomplishment precisely of this terrible result. Never was there so glorious a morning, so suddenly lost and forgotten in thick impenetrable clouds ! The grandeur of the enterprise is equalled only by the greatness of its failure. And what is that fearful whisper that seems to steal upon us, in view of it, from the very depths of the bottomless pit : "This man began to build, and was not *able* to finish ?" But here again the hypothesis is ready with its own answer. The failure was not final. So long as the Bible lived, there was still room for hope ; and at last accordingly, "in the fulness of time," after centuries upon centuries of ecclesiastical chaos, God was pleased

to say once more, "Let there be light," and there *was* light. The reformers of the 16th century drew forth from the sacred volume, by the help of God's Spirit, the true scheme and pattern of the christian faith, as it was in the beginning. The spell of ages was broken. Christ gave tokens that he was again at the head of his church. The unfinished work of the first and second centuries was once more actively and vigorously resumed. In the form of Protestantism, it may *now* be expected, after so long a time, to go forward conquering and to conquer, until all enemies are subdued under the Saviour's feet. True, Popery is not still dead, and Protestantism itself is getting into huge difficulties; but we must now have faith in Christ's headship over his church, and in his promise that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it; so as to be firmly persuaded, in spite of all fears and discouragements, that the right course which things have at last taken must certainly prove successful in the end, and that he who sits king in Zion will not rest till he shall have brought forth judgment unto victory.

Will any sober minded man pretend to say, that this, in itself considered, is not a strange and unnatural hypothesis, which it is exceedingly hard to reconcile, either with the divine origin of the church, or with its divine mission, or with the divine presence in it of Him, who is represented as having the government of the world on his shoulders for its defence and salvation?

But the case becomes yet more difficult, when we look into the sacred oracles which lie back of the actual history of the church, and find that instead of lending any countenance to this scheme prospectively, they set before us in the most plain and unquestionable terms an altogether different prospect. Some few passages, we know, have been impressed by a strained and violent exegesis into the service of the theory, by being made in sound at least to foretell a general apostacy of the church, the features of which it has been pretended to identify in the Papal communion; and it is not uncommon to hear the enemies of Popery appealing to these perversions of scripture as the very voice of inspiration itself, and charging those who question the infallibility of their gloss with setting themselves against the authority of God's word. But the day for such arbitrary and unhistorical interpretation, it may be trusted, is now fast coming to an end. On the field of science at least, it is fairly and fully exploded. No real biblical scholar, in any part of the world, is found willing to endorse the vulgar anti-popery sense of these pet texts. On the other hand, however, there are many single passages and texts, which clearly foretell the unfailing stability

of the church, through all ages, on to the end of time. And what perhaps is of still more account, the whole drift and scope of the Bible look always in the same direction, and in this direction only.

Even under the Old Testament, it was a standing article of faith that the theocracy could not fail. But this perpetuity was itself the type only of that higher and better state, in which the Jewish theocracy was to become complete finally as the New Testament church. If it lay in the conception of the old that it should not prove a failure, much more must this be taken to lie in the conception of the new. It is to the times of the Messiah in this view emphatically, that the predictions and promises of the Old Testament in relation to the coming fortunes of the church especially refer. All join in the assurance, that the kingdom then to be set up should be an everlasting kingdom, and that of its dominion and glory there should be no end. Nothing could well be more foreign from the old Messianic scheme, than the imagination that the enlargement of Jacob, by the coming of Shiloh, was to give place almost immediately again to a long night of captivity and bondage, ten times worse than that of Babylon, from which there was to be no escape for more than a thousand years. And just as little can any such view be reconciled with the plan of Christianity, as it meets us in the New Testament. This proceeds everywhere on the assumption, that the kingdom of God, or the church, as now established among men, was destined, not to fall but to stand, not to pass away like the streams of the desert, but to be as the waters of the sanctuary rather, in Ezekiel's vision, an ever deepening and perpetual river. There are, it is true, predictions enough of trials, heresies, apostacies and corruptions; but the idea is never for a moment allowed, that these should prevail in any such universal way as the theory before us pretends. On the contrary, the strongest assurances are given, that this should not be the case.

These stand forth most conspicuously and solemnly, in those wonderful passages from the mouth of the blessed Saviour himself, which form as it were the charter of the church and its heavenly commission to the end of time. "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church; and the *gates of hell shall not prevail against it*" Matth. xvi. 18. The use which the Romanists make of this text, must not blind us to its true magnificence and grandeur. It is still scripture; and we are bound, as good Protestants, to pause with some reverence before it, and to inquire with seriousness what it actually does

mean. Take it as we may, it looks certainly like a most explicit pledge, in terms of unusual solemnity and deliberation, that the church should endure on its first foundation, that is with true historical succession from its own beginning, through all ages. Of the same tenor again precisely is the apostolic commission, after our Saviour's resurrection and just before his ascension: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: Go ye *therefore*, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And, lo, *I am with you alway, even* unto the end of the world" Matth. xxviii: 18-20. Here again we have scripture, under a most majestic and commanding form. Has it any meaning answerable to its magnificent terms, or is it a mere flourish of Oriental figures which mean the next thing to nothing? Words could hardly be put together in a way more significantly suited to express the idea, that the object of this commission was one which could not possibly suffer failure or defeat. The enterprise in view is conditioned by the fact, that all power is in the Saviour's hands, that he is head over all things, as Paul expresses it, to the church; and all conceivable difficulties attending it, as in the case of Moses when sent to bring Israel out of Egypt, are reduced to nothing by the one overwhelming consideration, "*Lo, I am with you always,*" engaging the entire plenitude of this power for its never ending success. It is useless to dwell on other testimonies that look immediately in the same direction. If these capital and classical passages have no power to fix attention or constrain belief, it is not to be imagined that any amount of scriptural evidence besides will be felt to carry with it any real weight.

It is very certain, that only the most wilful and stubborn prejudice can fail to see, how utterly at war the Bible is with the notion of a quickly apostatizing and totally failing church, in any view answerable to the strange Puritan hypothesis which we have now under consideration. No such notion accordingly ever entered the mind of the primitive church itself. It was for a time supposed indeed that the end of the world was near at hand, and that the resurrection state or millenium would soon appear; and it was only gradually, that this view gave place to the idea of a long course of history preparing the way for Christ's second coming. But neither in the one form nor in the other, was the thought ever admitted that the church itself might collapse or go into universal dismal eclipse. That would have been counted downright infidelity. The promise to Peter and

the apostolic commission were never taken but in one sense ; and that appeared to be so plain, that no one but an unbeliever, it was supposed, could ever think of seriously calling it in question. It became accordingly, as we all know, an element of the primitive faith, an article of the early creed, to believe in the being of the holy catholic church as an indestructible fact, a divine mystery that could never fail or pass away.

The biblical doctrine on this subject is so clear indeed, that even the most unhistorical advocates of the Puritan theory are themselves constrained to allow it ; though they take care to put it into a shape to suit their own preconceived scheme. Nothing is more common than to hear them talk of the unfailing and enduring character of the church, of its being founded on a rock, and of Christ's presence with it always for its protection and defence ; they are willing to say with the ancient creed, when necessary, " We believe in the church as one, holy, catholic and apostolical." But by all this they mean in the end, not the church in any outward and visible view, not the historical organization known under this name and claiming these titles from the third century down to the sixteenth, but a supposed succession of hidden and scattered witnesses, in the so called catholic church partly, but more generally after a time on the outside of it, handing down what the theory is pleased to call a pure faith, in conflict with the reigning system, and in the way of more or less direct protest against it as an anti-christian usurpation. It is of the invisible church only, they tell us, the secret " election in Israel," that the glorious things spoken of Zion are to be understood. The church was in the wilderness for a thousand years before the Reformation, among the Waldenses, Albigenses, Henricians, Paulicians, and such like ; God was never altogether without a handful of people somewhere, that refused to bow the knee to Baal. No such evasion however is of any force in truth, for getting clear of the difficulty which we have here in view. It turns in the first place on a mere arbitrary assumption, borrowed from the clouds, and got up palpably to serve a purpose, without the least regard to historical facts and dates ; an assumption that is doomed therefore, by necessary consequence, to dissolve before the light of history more and more into mere fog and mist. These sects of the middle ages are bad stuff at best, for making out the romance of a pure Christianity, from the fifth century to the fifteenth, on the outside of the Roman church. But allowing them to have been as good as the theory before us affects to believe, and granting it besides a fair proportion of sporadic exceptional cases of piety,

in the reigning church itself, to fill up the thin and airy succession, what sound mind can be satisfied still to take *this* for any fitting verification of the glowing predictions of the Old Testament, any true fulfilment of the high sounding promises and pledges that are contained in the New? No *such* construction of these predictions and promises certainly ever entered into the mind of the primitive church itself; the construction is perfectly foreign from the sense of the ancient creed; and we may safely say, that nothing short of the most powerful prejudice in favor of a previously established theory can account in any case, for its being accepted as in the least degree satisfactory or probable. The whole is a subterfuge plainly, got up to escape the clear and proper sense of the Bible, and not an honest commentary by any means designed to meet this sense in a fair and open way.

The difficulty then stands before us still in its full strength. The helplessness of the plea thus put in to turn aside its force, only serves to give it greater weight. The more we bring the case home in an actual way to our thoughts, the more are we likely to be confounded with its palpable monstrosity. Puritanism puts an enormous tax upon our faith from the very outset, when it requires us to believe things so contradictory and mutually destructive as are here brought together in one and the same theory or scheme. That the church should have such a history behind it as that of the Old Testament, such a glorious array of miracles, types, prophecies, heralding and foreshadowing its advent, for thousands of years, as the desire of all nations, the last sense and grand fulfilment of all previous revelations; that its actual inauguration in the world should be so every way worthy of this stupendous world-embracing proem, in the mystery of the incarnation itself, ("God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, &c." 1 Tim. v: 16.), in "promises exceedingly great and precious," and high guaranties from the throne of heaven, in signs and wonders and miracles, and in wide pentecostal triumphs throughout the Roman empire; that Christianity should start thus, under such divine auspices, the glorified Saviour head over all things for its single cause and sake, and ever present by his Spirit in the midst of it according to his own word, and by infallible tokens also making his presence known and felt on all sides; that the church in these circumstances should look upon itself as an institution founded upon a rock, and make it an article of faith that its charter could not fail: and yet, that in fact all began to fail, to go into confusion, to run towards apostacy, before the end of the second century; that

this fearful tendency, in spite of Christ's headship in heaven and his, *Lo, I am with you always*, on earth, through fires of martyrdom and unheard of sacrifices for the faith once delivered to the saints, so far prevailed actually as in the course of two or three centuries more to turn this whole faith into a lie ; that the church in short, under its original corporate character, ran out historically into a complete and universal failure, so as to be for a whole millenium of the most horrible spiritual darkness and desolation, a mere synagogue of Satan, the enemy of all truth and righteousness, seeking only to pull down and destroy what Christ (King in Zion Ps. ii: 1-6) was still trying to build here and there, by such people as the Paulicians and Albigenses: All this taken together, we say, requires such a cormorant credulity for its full reception, that the most careless minds, when brought to think only a little for themselves, are very likely to start back aghast from the scheme, and may well be excused for gently asking, By what authority and right does it pretend so to lord it over our faith?

It would seem reasonable to expect in so improbable a case, that the main positions of the theory at least would be so supported by clear historical proof, as to carry with them some sort of coercive force for such as are willing and anxious to know the truth. An apostacy so profound and total should be properly attested in some way, by historical testimonies and monuments. Allowing it to have come in gradually, this only gives us the more right to expect and demand the evidence of which we now speak. So vast a revolution, in such view, implies of necessity a moral struggle, a conflict of principles and aims, a tumult of inharmonious and opposing forces. To say that the primitive church yielded passively to the great apostacy from the beginning, without contradiction or protest, is to make it from the very first, not "the pillar and ground of the truth," but the mother of error itself; to conceive of it as built, not on a rock beating back the strong floods of hell, but on the mere sand at the mercy of all winds and waves. The least we can ask then, is to have set before us in history some traces of this grand ecclesiastical catastrophe, by which all our *a priori* conceptions of Christianity are so confounded, and our faith in its divine origin and heavenly commission is so terribly tried. And as we should have clear proof in this way of the failure of the church in the beginning, it would seem but reasonable also that we should not be left to take the Reformation on trust subsequently as a merely human work. Allow the continuous stability of the church, as a divine institution carrying in itself down to that time the

promises and gifts with which it was freighted in the beginning, and we may at least try to justify Protestantism as a true product of this historical life itself; in which view it might need no higher warrant perhaps for its vindication. But give up the historical succession, by taking the ground that the church had failed for a thousand years, except among sects from which it is notorious Protestantism did *not* spring, and that the Reformation was in truth a new setting up of Christianity parallel with its first setting up by the Apostles; and then really we see not, why the proper credentials of a truly apostolical commission should be wanting in the second case more than in the first. Luther himself did not hesitate to pose the radicalism of the Anabaptists with this test: "If they have a commission from God, let them prove it by *miracles*." But if the Reformation itself is to be taken for what this Puritan theory makes it, we must say it was quite as much a new church as the enterprise of Storck and Munzer, and needed quite as much the argument of miracles for its support.

But now when we look into the actual course of history, we find it in no agreement whatever with these reasonable presumptions and anticipations, as directed either towards the end of this supposed failure of the church or towards its beginning. The Reformation, we all know, lacked entirely the seal of miracles, the only truly apostolical warrant for a really apostolical work. In this respect it bore no resemblance to the mission of Elijah, the restorer of Moses in the apostate kingdom of Israel. That such an apostacy, reaching through a thousand years, should finally be set right in this way, is not a little strange. On the other hand however, the coming in of the apostacy is more strangely conditioned still. Never was a revolution so vast and important, so broad and deep in its course, so sweepingly disastrous in its effects. We may apply to it without exaggeration the strong figure: "In those days the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken." The church, having in charge the most vital interests of a fallen world, proved recreant to her solemn trust, fell from her high estate, and became literally the seat of Antichrist and a synagogue of Satan. Thus fearfully radical, the revolution was at the same time no less dreadfully universal. And yet, strange to say, no one can tell when or how it came to pass. We have indeed certain schemes that pretend to be such an explanation. But these, when examined, are found to be purely fanciful attempts to solve the demands of a theory already adopted, rather

than the exhibition of actual historical grounds for the theory itself. It is assumed in the first place that a certain form of religion, Puritanism for instance, is taught in the New Testament, and therefore that it must have prevailed in the apostolical and primitive church; it is very evident in the next place, that a wholly different form of religion prevailed in the church of the third and fourth centuries, a system intrinsically at war with Puritanism and leading directly towards full Catholicism; here then the fact of an apostacy is supposed to be historically established, and any combination now is taken to be rational and legitimate that serves at all to bind the two sides of it plausibly together. So we have various pretty plans or methods, that of the Quakers, that of the Baptists, that of the Independents, that of the Presbyterians, and coming down somewhat farther that also of the Episcopalians, setting forth with more or less particularity how the corruption of pure Christianity in the first ages took place, first one step and then another, till at last the face of it was totally altered and changed; but if we call for the direct proof of these fine spun constructions, we find it to be either wanting altogether, or at best to consist in a few stray words, picked up here and there without regard to the general formation from which they are taken, and of such slippery and extremely brittle sense, that one may well feel astounded to see what weight they are made to bear. It seems to be counted sufficient for the most part, if no direct proof can be quoted the other way, or if the force of any such quotation can be ingeniously set aside. If Irenæus speak not of infant baptism in terms that cut-off all captious debate, the Baptists hold it a good argument that the baptism of infants in his time was unknown. If Justin Martyr teach not diocesan episcopacy in the same terms with Cyprian, the Presbyterians lay hold of him as a good witness that the ambition of prelacy was not yet born. If the primacy of the Roman see be not positively declared by the earliest fathers in round set phrase, the Episcopalians take it as so much testimony that this usurpation, as they call it, came in at a later day. If it appear that the Apostles' Creed is not quoted in its full present form before the fourth century, Puritanism chuckles over the nice discovery, and on the strength of it proceeds at once to deny its apostolical and primitive authority, treating its article of the church as a figment, and seeing in it the germs at least of all sorts of Popish error and delusion. And so it goes throughout the chapter. It never seems to enter the head of these self-complacent theorizers, that the burden of proof lies of right first and foremost upon themselves; that the difficulty of making out

clear and plain testimony in every case for the negative of their arbitrary positions, is not in and of itself any testimony whatever in favor of these positions; that the *indifference* of the argument in this form, the mere want of positive and direct testimony either way, is itself in truth a most powerful presumption, not in favor of their theories, but against them, and in favor only of the cause to which they are variously opposed. The grand difficulty is just to see, how so great an apostacy as is here supposed to have had place, turning the fair bride of the Lamb in so short a time into the similitude of a harlot, should have gone forward through its several stages or steps, as laid down in either of these schemes, and yet have left no trace of its dire revolutionary march on the historic page!

That false tendencies might begin to work in a pure state of the church, is not hard to believe. But the case before us involves immeasurably more than this. These tendencies are taken to be from the start in full opposition to the genius and spirit of the Gospel; they work rapidly in fact towards its overthrow; they bring in by degrees new ideas and practices altogether, the fruit of cunning secular pride and borrowed from Judaism or Paganism, that go directly to undermine and break up the simple evangelical system of earlier times; and yet they provoke no opposition, excite no alarm, but make an easy prey of the whole church, as it would seem, without a protesting cry or a contradictory stroke. The ministers took the lead in the bad movement, and the people fell in passively with their wrong guidance. All sorts of pious lies and forgeries were resorted to for its support; and the daughter of Zion was either too silly to perceive the fraud, or too sleepy to lay it seriously to heart. The old faith died thus, and gave no sign. The apostacy came in without an effort or a struggle. True, as we are told, it had stages and degrees. But each new stage found a generation ready to accept it, as the undoubted sense of the faith they had received from their fathers. The work went silently but surely forward always in the same false direction. It carried along with it the universal church. When this comes fully into view in the fourth century, we find, not a part of it merely, but the entire body fully committed to the sacramental, liturgical, churchly and priestly system, with the full persuasion that the whole of it had come down from the earliest times. All history may be defied, to furnish any parallel to such a revolution, any change political or religious at once so vast and yet so entirely without noise. It passes before us like a scene of magic. As some one has observed, it is as though the world on some one night had

gone to bed Protestant or Puritan, and on waking the next morning found itself thoroughly and universally Catholic.

Only think of a single province, such as modern New England for instance, in the course of one or two hundred years throwing off the whole type of its religion in this way, and with general consent accepting another of diametrically opposite character and cast, without a single monument to inform posterity how the thing was done. Think of her associations and consecrations, with their system of parity and rank democracy, passing over in so short a time to a well ordered hierarchy, revolving round a single centre. Think of her free prayers losing themselves in liturgical forms, her naked spiritualism stooping to clothe itself with the mummery of outward ceremonies and rites, crossings, bowings, sprinklings, with all the paraphernalia of a truly pontifical worship. Think of her sacraments turning from barren signs into supernatural mysteries, of the simple memorial of the Lord's supper in particular assuming the character of a real sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, and running into the bold and utterly confounding tenet of transubstantiation. Think of her mission of worldly prudence, utility, materialism and common sense, running out into the glorification of monasticism, voluntary poverty, the angelical life of celibates and virgins. Imagine these and other kindred transformations, we say, accomplished between the days of Dr. Increase Mather and those of President Dwight, and all so smoothly and quietly as to leave no trace, not a solitary record or sign of resistance, protestation, division or dissent, to inform posterity in any case when or how the change took place. Would it not be a moral miracle, transcending entirely the common order of history? But in the hypothesis before us, the miracle goes far beyond this. It embraces not one province only, but many, widely separated in space, and differing in every social and national respect. It is universal Christendom, from Britain to Africa, from Spain to India, that is found to have yielded simultaneously to the spirit of defection and revolt, as though it had been animated through all its borders with one and the same principle of evil, bewildering its senses and hurrying it among the tombs. Nothing could better show the universality of the supposed apostacy, and the deep root it had taken previously in the mind and life of the church, than the grand divisions that took place in the fourth and fifth centuries; giving rise to rival communions on a vast scale, some of which have upheld themselves down to the present time. These could not of course consent in any such innovation after they fell asund-

er ; on the contrary, the laws of party and sect would have been sure to bring out a loud complaint of the change, if anything of the sort lay within the reach of knowledge before. But the Arians and Donatists brought no charge here against the Catholics. The Nestorians and Monophysites went out and founded new churches, which remain to this day ; but they carried along with them the characteristic peculiarities of the Roman system, which they have never ceased since to regard as of truly apostolical force and date. These have indeed become for the most part mere petrifications or dead fossil remains ; but in this character they still bear powerful and unanswerable testimony to the fact of which we now speak, the universal and unquestioned authority of this system throughout Christendom in the fourth century. No language written on rocks for this purpose, could be more sure or plain.

The contrast in which this noiseless revolution stands with the known vigilance of the church in other things, serves to make it still more striking and strange. Christianity in the beginning was anything but a passive and inert system, which offered itself like wax to every impression from abroad. It had a most intense life of its own, power to assimilate and reject in the sea of elements with which it was surrounded, the force of self-conservation over against all dissolving agencies, as never any system of thought or life before. It is just this organic and all subduing character that forms the grand argument from history, for its divine origin and heavenly truth. Neander has it continually in view. What subtle speculations were not tried, in the first centuries on the part of the Gnostics, Manicheans, Sabellians, Arians, and others, to corrupt the truth ; and yet how promptly and vigorously all these innovations were met and repelled. It was not reflection either that led the way in these contests with heresy, but a fine tact rather and living instinct for the orthodoxy to which they were always opposed. Danger was felt with keen inward sensibility even afar off, and no time was lost in sounding an alarm. There is no lack accordingly of historical witnesses and monuments, to show here what actually took place. They abound in the form of controversies, councils, heretical parties, and wide-spread long enduring schisms. And yet in the midst of all this vigilant activity, if we are to believe our Puritan hypothesis, the great apostacy of Popery came in upon the universal church so quietly that no one now can lay his hand on the origin of a single one of all its manifold forms of corruption and abuse. It gave rise to no controversy, created no party, led to no schism. The Argus-

eyed jealousy of the heretical sects themselves was blinded and deceived. They saw not the wholesale treason which was going forward in such bold and impudent style ; and it was allowed by all of them accordingly to pass, without one syllable of remonstrance or rebuke.

But this is not all. The prodigiousness of the theory goes still farther. It is by the Bible it pretends to be sure that the church started on the Puritan model, and that this later state of it therefore must be counted a grand falling away from its first and only true form. But now the Bible itself comes down to us through the hands of this same apostate church, which made no conscience, we are sometimes told, of forging and falsifying documents, to almost any extent, for the purpose of carrying out its own wrong ; and we have absolutely to take it on trust from the credit solely of this suspicious source. This is particularly clear, in the case of the New Testament, the main authority of course for the question here in debate. What authority was it that fixed the sacred canon, determining in the beginning what books were to be taken as inspired, and what other books not a few were to be rejected as apocryphal or false ? The authority precisely of that very organization, which these same canonical writings are now brought forward to convict of palpable wholesale unfaithfulness to its own trust ; and which was in the full career of such sad apostacy indeed, while diligently and as it would seem most faithfully fulfilling this great commission, for the use of the world in later ages. The work of settling the canon began in the second century, but was not fully completed before the fourth ; and then it was by the tradition and authority of the church simply that the work, regarded through all this time as one and the same, was brought thus to its final consummation. We have already seen however, where the church stood in the fourth century, and in what direction all its forces were tending in the third. Is it not strange, that we should be under obligation to such a growing mystery of iniquity for so excellent and holy a gift, and that coming to us in this way we can still be so sure that every line of it is inspired, so as to make it the only rule of our faith ? Is it not strange that the very Church, which had still divine tact enough for the delicate function of settling the canon, had at the same time no power to see or feel her own glaring departures from the light of this infallible rule, but actually gloried in it as the oracle and voucher of her claims ;—not dreaming how, after the lapse of twelve hundred years, it should blaze forth into quite another signification, and be a swift witness against herself, as the whore of Babylon, the mother of abominations and lies.

Nor does the wonder stop here. The faithful execution of this most responsible task of settling the canon, and handing down an uncorrupted Bible, for the use of all following time, is not the only merit of the ancient church. These ages of apostacy, as they are here considered, were at the same time, by general acknowledgment, ages of extraordinary faith and power. Miracles abounded. Charity had no limits. Zeal stopped at no sacrifices, however hard or great. The blood of martyrs flowed in torrents. The heroism of confessors braved every danger. Bishops ruled at the peril of their lives. In the catalogue of Roman popes, no less than thirty before the time of Constantine, that is, the whole list that far with only two or three exceptions, wear the crown of martyrdom. Nor was this zeal outward only, the fanaticism of a name or a sect. Along with it burned, as we have seen before, a glowing interest in the truth, an inextinguishable ardor in maintaining the faith once delivered to the saints. Heresies quailed from its presence. Schisms withered under its blasting rebuke. Thus, in the midst of all opposition, it went forward from strength to strength, till in the beginning of the fourth century finally we behold it fairly seated on the throne of the Cæsars. And this outward victory, as Neander will tell us, was but a faint symbol of the far more important revolution it had already accomplished in the empire of human thought, the interior world of the spirit. Here was brought to pass, in the same time, a true creation from the bosom of chaos, such as the world had never seen before, over which the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy. In foundation and principle at least, old things, whether of philosophy, or of art, or of morality and social life, were passed away, and, lo, all things had become new. This is the grand argument for Christianity from its *miraculous success*; of which Puritanism, when it suits, is ready to make as loud use as any part of the church besides, as though it really believed this ancient glory to be in some way after all truly and properly its own. And yet by the same Puritanism we are told again, when another object is in view, that the cause which thus conquered the world by manifest supernatural power, was itself so deserted and abandoned by its glorified King, as to be all the while rushing at the same time towards universal apostacy and ruin, by the mystery of sin which it carried in its own womb!

And then again, when this mystery came fully out, and the apostacy stood completely revealed in the form of full grown and undisguised Popery, followed as we all know by the long deep night of the middle ages, there was still no end to the mor-

al wonders of which we now speak. The Papacy itself is a wonder of wonders. There is nothing like it in all history besides. So all will feel, who stop to *think* about it in more than a fool's way. History too, even in Protestant hands, is coming more and more to do justice to the vast and mighty merits of the system in past times, bringing in light upon it, and scaring away the owls and bats that have so long been accustomed to hoot and flit here at their own will. These ages of darkness as they are called, were still, to an extent now hard to understand, ages also of faith. The church still had, as in earlier days, her miracles, her martyrdoms, her missionary zeal, her holy bishops and saints, her works of charity and love, her care for sound doctrine, her sense of a heavenly commission, and her more than human power to convert and subdue nations. True, the world was dark, very dark and very wild; and its corruptions were powerfully felt at times in her own bosom; but no one but a simpleton or a knave will pretend to make this barbarism *her* work, or to lay it as a crime to *her* charge. She was the rock that beat back its proud waves. She was the power of order and law, the fountain of a new civilization, in the midst of its tumultuating chaos. Take the conversion of Saxon England in the time of Gregory the Great and the long work of moral organization with which it was followed in succeeding centuries. Look at the missionaries that proceeded from this island, apostolical bishops and holy monks, in the seventh and eighth centuries, planting churches successfully in the countries of the Rhine. Consider the entire evangelization of the new barbarous Europe. Is it not a work fairly parallel, to say the least, with the conquest of the old Roman empire in the first ages? Is not the argument of "miraculous success" quite as strong here as there? Think again of the theology of this old Catholic church, of its body of ethics, of its canon law. The cathedral of Cologne is no such work as this last; the dome of St. Peter is less sublimely grand than the first. How wonderful, that the theological determinations of the fifth and sixth centuries, in the midst of endless agitation and strife, should fall so steadily the right way; and also that these true conclusions should seem to hang so constantly, in the last instance, on the mind and voice of Rome. And then in the ages that followed, how wonderful again, that when there was but small power to build, nothing should be done at least to unsettle and pull down the edifice of sound doctrine as it stood before. However much of rubbish the Reformation found occasion to remove, it was still compelled to do homage to the main body of the Roman theo-

gy as orthodox and right ; and to this day Protestantism has no valid mission in the world, any farther than it is willing to build on this old foundation. Its distinctive doctrines are of no force, except in organic union with the grand scheme of truth, which is exhibited in the ancient creeds and in the decisions of the first general councils. Cut off from this root, taken out from the stream of this only sure and safe tradition, even the authority of the Bible becomes uncertain, and the article of justification by faith itself is turned into a perilous lie. In every view, we may say, the work and mission of the church after the fourth century continue to be, as they were before, the most wonderful and solemn fact in the world. And yet, according to the theory now in hand, it was no longer an apostatizing church merely, but a body fully apostate, fallen from the truth, opposed to righteousness, in league with Satan, and systematically bent on destroying all that Christ came into the world to build. Antichrist, the man of sin, reigned terribly supreme, "sitting in the temple of God, and opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped." How truly confounding the incongruous combination ! How perfectly self-satirical the incoherent face of the contradiction !

The theory is false. It rests on no historical bottom. The scriptures are against it. All sound religious feeling is at war with it. Facts of every sort conspire to prove it untrue. It is a sheer hypothesis, a sort of Protestant myth we may call it, got up to serve a purpose, and hardened by time and tradition now into the form of a sacred prejudice ; or rather it is an arbitrary construction, that seeks to turn into mere myth and fable the true history of the church. In this view we have said, that it may fairly challenge comparison with the famous critical systems of such men as Strauss and Baur. Indeed these are in some respects more plausible. They take the ground, that Christianity as we have it now in the New Testament is a product properly of the second century, rather than the true birth historically of the first ; that the original facts and doctrines were far more simple ; that the religious imagination of the infant church, or the spirit of controversy among its Jewish and Gentile parties, idealized all into new shape and form ; and that most of our canonical books were then forged according to this new and higher scheme, and piously fathered upon the apostles to give them more credit and weight. Monstrous as this representation is, it is truly wonderful what a show of learning, critical and historical, can be urged in its favor, enough almost to deceive at times the very elect themselves. And yet it is a wild theory,

which needs no other force to upset it in the end than the simple persuasion, that the church itself is of divine origin, and not the most abominable imposture that ever has appeared in the world. The article : "I believe in the holy catholic church," which must ever precede in the order of faith, as Augustine tells us, that other article : "I believe in the holy inspired bible," wherever it really prevails in the heart, scatters to the wind all imaginable sophistries and subtleties in this form. The logic of Hegel before it, becomes no better than a spider's web. The true answer to Strauss, as well as to the whole Tübingen school, is an act of faith in the mystery of Christianity itself, as we have this concretely set forth in the ancient creed. But now what better after all, as tried by the touchstone of such faith, is the Puritan theory at which we are now looking? Is it not equally borrowed from the clouds, and at the same time equally fatal to all firm and full confidence in the supernatural origin and mission of the church, whose history it pretends to follow in so strange a way? To allow the suppositions of Strauss or of Baur, is from the very outset to drag down Christianity from the skies, and to make its whole signification not only human merely and earthly, but grossly carnal also and devilish. It is morally impossible to conceive of its rise and growth in any such style, and yet look upon it as a direct revelation in any way from heaven. The two conceptions are incompatible, and go at once to destroy each other. And just so also, we say, to allow the historical suppositions of Puritanism, is to convert the divine origin of the church into a fiction or a dream. Even such a scheme of history as we have in Mosheim for instance, or in the text book of Gieseler with all its show of authorities, is intrinsically at war with any real faith in this mystery, and can never fail to undermine it where no antidote is in the way. The sense of authorities, the force even of facts, turns always on the standpoint from which they are viewed. An infidel hypothesis necessarily sees all persons and things in the light of its own evil and false eye. Both Mosheim and Gieseler in this way are very little better than Gibbon. To accept their disposition and combination of facts, is of necessity to give up secretly the whole idea, that the glorious things spoken of Zion in the beginning ever had any truth. But the common Puritan scheme goes farther still in this infidel direction. It outrages all moral verisimilitude, and joins together such contraries as by no possibility *can* cohere in the same real and firm belief. What sane mind can bring its theory of the wholesale errors and corruptions of the early church, into any sort of harmony with the

assured feeling, that the heavenly and supernatural conditions of its presence in the world were ever in any real sense what they are described as being, either in the New Testament or in the ancient creeds? There is not the least doubt, but that the theory in fact tends directly to destroy all such assurance, by the monstrous and violent incompatibility of its own terms. This does not imply indeed a formal giving up of the point in question, as an article of so called faith. That is the true logical end of the contradiction. But all men have not logic; and it is quite possible to carry out the rationalism in another form. The article may be shorn of all historical connections, and thrust out from the real world altogether, so that the supernatural in the case shall have no actual being whatever in the bosom of the natural, but be only as a cloud or dream floating over it and beyond it in Gnostic or Nestorian style. In such shape it may be possible still, to believe in a holy catholic church, which was from the very start the mere foot-ball of Satan. But in the same way it is possible also to believe, that the moon is made of green cheese.

And so we come finally to the conclusion, towards which this discussion has been looking and reaching all along, that there never was in truth any such identity as Puritanism dreams between the early church and its own modern self. Its hypothesis of the vast and terrible revolution by which all is taken to have fallen so soon into another type, is unnatural, unhistorical, irreligious, and fairly incredible; and we have a right to infer accordingly that its primary premise is false. No such primeval state ever existed, as makes it necessary to consider the whole subsequent history of the church an apostacy only and a grand universal lie. Dr. Bacon and others are entirely mistaken, when they imagine any counterpart to New England Congregationalism in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, or please themselves with the thought that the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, in the second century, suffered for just such views of truth as are now preached in the pulpits of Connecticut and Massachusetts. An overwhelming presumption of the contrary lies before us in the later history of the church; and it needs only some proper freedom from prejudice, we will now add, to find this presumption abundantly confirmed by the historical data of this older period itself. True, these are comparatively sparse, and often a good deal indefinite and vague; and it is not impossible for an adroit criticism, on this account, to twist them to its own mind—especially if it have *carte blanche* to treat as interpolation or corruption every passage that may prove refractory in the

process. But the violence of all such criticism appears plainly enough on its own front, and when it has made the most of its cause in this way, the proofs that stand in clear force against it are still amply sufficient for the purpose now affirmed. The force of the argument is sometimes enfeebled and obscured, by fixing attention too exclusively on single points and particular phrases and texts. But what the case requires, is a steady regard to the broad issue in question as a whole, and a fair estimate of the testimony or evidence concerned under the like universal view. It is not necessary to stickle for this or that point separately considered; nor is it worth while to waste either ink or breath, in settling the credit or fixing the sense of one clause here and another there, in the remains of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, or Irenæus. The main question in controversy is of far wider scope and range than any such particular eddies raised in its bosom, and is capable of being brought to some general conclusion in a much more comprehensive and summary way. It regards not so much mere prelacy, or the use of a liturgy in this or that particular form, or the positive practice of infant baptism at a given time, or the mode in which the water was applied in this sacrament whether in the case of infants or adults, or the acknowledgment of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass—it regards not so much any one or all of these and such like points separately taken, we say, as it does rather the whole idea and scheme of the church, in which all such points are comprehended, and from which they derive necessarily in the end their proper significance and import. The determination of these single points, we know, is of no small consequence, where it can be fairly reached, for the settlement also of this general and main question. But what we wish to say is, that in the case before us the main question is not thrown absolutely or conclusively on any particular issues of this sort, which it may be possible for a small criticism to envelope here and there in dust or smoke. The general spirit and form of early Christianity are capable of being understood from its few historical remains, especially when taken in connection with the tradition of following times, in such manner as fairly to overwhelm the nibbling of such mouse-like criticism at particular points, instead of being dependent upon it at all in any way for their own authority. The sense of the whole here is so clear and plain, that we have the best right to use it as a key or guide for the interpretation of the parts. Take for instance the Baptist points of immersion and the exclusion of infants from the church; all turns finally on the light in which the sacrament of baptism

itself was regarded, and so on the view taken of the supernatural constitution of Christianity; and it requires nothing more than the most general acquaintance with the first age of the church, and the writings that have come down to us from that time, to see and feel surely that the whole standpoint of Christianity then was completely different from that of the Baptists in the present day; so that no proof they may ever seem to have for their favorite hobbies can have any force at all to identify the one position with the other. Allowing the points of correspondence they claim to be real, to what can it amount still so long as it is plain, that the whole inward posture of the early church was in contradiction to the unmystical, unsacramental and unchurchly system, in which the Baptists now glory as pre eminently their own? The best and most sufficient defence against this system after all, is simply to be somewhat imbued with the general soul of the primitive church, as it looks forth upon us from the writings of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus and Tertullian. With any such preparation, no one can be in danger of mistaking the modern fiction for the ancient truth. They belong to different worlds; and only to be at home in the one, is necessarily to feel the other in the same measure foreign and strange.

It is in this general way that we propose now, to try briefly the whole question here offered for our consideration. May the Puritan system as a whole, whether carried out in the Baptist or in the Congregational or in the Presbyterian form, or allowed even to get as far as low-church Episcopalianism, be regarded as constitutionally one and the same with what Christianity was in the second century, and so by implication in the latter part also of the first? To settle this question, we need not go minutely into the Ignatian controversy, or any other of like accidental and mechanical character. Strike out as an interpolation every passage in Ignatius that goes directly for episcopacy, and for the argument now in hand but little is lost from the weight that truly and properly belongs to him as a witness. For a really thoughtful mind, this weight lies in no such texts nakedly taken, but in the reigning drift and complexion of the epistles as a whole. A very short writing in this way, such for instance as Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan, where there is any power whatever to reproduce in the mind its historical surroundings, may convey by its total representation far more than any criticism can reach by mere verbal dissection. In this way it is very easy, we think, to bring the question here propounded to a full and conclusive settlement. Whatever Christianity may have

been in the second century, and in the age immediately following that of the Apostles, it was not the system that is now known and honored as Puritanism, and least of all was it this system under its most approved and complete form as it reigns at the present time in New England.

I. In the first place, it rested throughout on a wholly different conception of the *Church*. With Puritanism, the church is acknowledged to be divine, as having been founded originally by Christ, and as standing still in some way under the superintendence of his Spirit. But this supernatural character, in the end, resolves itself very much into an unhistorical abstraction. The church is not conceived of as a real outward as well as inward constitution, having in such view of its own organism as a single whole, and keeping up a true identity with itself in space and time. It is of the nature rather of a school; the divinity of it falls back entirely upon its doctrine; or rather on the Bible which is taken to contain this doctrine, while men are left to draw it from this source, as they best can, in a perfectly human way. The only realization of the church after all in the world, thus, is in the form of an invisible communion, representing all those who are happy enough, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to find the truth. In the way of such inward spiritual experience, on the part of individuals, there is room to speak still of supernatural operations reaching over into the sphere of our present life; but to dream of any other supernaturalism in the church than this, is counted dangerous superstition. The idea of the church in this way is stripped of all mystery; it falls to the level of any other social or political institution; to believe in it is just as easy, as to believe in the Copernican system or the Parliament of Great Britain. It is neither catholic nor apostolical, except as Aristotle's philosophy may be called Aristotelian for all who are satisfied that he was the author of it. No divine obligation, no supernatural necessity, accordingly, is felt to go along with any actual organization bearing this name; a thousand organizations, wholly independent of one another, may have equal right to such distinction; and though all should fail even for centuries, it would be perfectly possible to restore the machinery again in full force, at any time, and with all its original powers, by the help simply of the Bible, the true *magna charta* of man's rights and privileges in this form. The divine character of the church is in no sense parallel, for Puritanism, with the divine character of the bible. It holds it for a sort of profanity to make any such account of its heavenly authority. Theoretically and practically, Puritanism treats the actual

church as a simply human institution, the work of man's hands, and of divine force at the last only as civil government is of such force, or in the sense rather of the republican maxim, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The powers of the organization, and so of course the offices by which they are to be executed, are held to come, not from above, but from below. It is made the glory of Christianity to be purely and intensely democratic. No *jure divino* constitution is to be allowed to the ministry, no superhuman force to its functions. The people are the fountain of right, and the basis of all order and law. Congregationalism completes itself in full Independence. All comes thus to the platform of common sense; all goes by popular judgment and popular vote.

Now it is not the truth or worth of this theory, in itself considered, that we are here required to discuss; we merely affirm, that it is in no sort of harmony with the idea of the church which prevailed in the second century. This might be confidently inferred indeed from the simple fact, acknowledged on all sides, that the ruling features of the later church system come fully into view in the next century, as the only scheme known or thought of throughout the Christian world. To imagine the Puritan ideal, as we have it now exemplified in New England, turning itself over, by complete somerset, in the course of one century, into the pattern of things presented for instance in Cyprian or the Apostolical Constitutions, without so much as a historical whisper to show when or how the prodigious revolution was brought to pass, is much like pretending to take Gulliver's travels or the stories of Sinbad the Sailor for sober truth. But besides this, the authorities of the second century itself are full against the whole fancy which is here in question. The drift and spirit of every writing that has come down to us from this time, look quite a different way. To read Ignatius, or Polycarp, or Justin Martyr, or Irenæus, or Tertullian, is to feel ourselves surrounded in the very act with a churchly element, a sense of the mystical and supernatural, which falls in easily enough with the later faith of the primitive church, but not at all with the keen clear air of modern Puritanism, as this sweeps either the heaths of Scotland or the bleak hills of New England. We need not stop here to settle the precise polity of the church at every point, in the age after the Apostles. It is enough to know, that all proceeded on a view of its supernatural rights and powers, which was exactly the reverse of what we have found to be the Puritan scheme. The church was considered a mystery, an object of faith, a supernatural fact in the world, not

based at all on the will of men, but on the commission of Christ, the force of which it was held extended from the Apostles forward through all time. It was taken to rest on the ministry, which was regarded accordingly as having its origin and authority, not from the people, but from God. The idea of a democratic or simply popular constitution in the case finds no countenance in the New Testament; this proceeds throughout on the assumption rather that the powers both of doctrine and government, for the church, start from above and not from below; the apostolate is the root of all following ministerial offices and functions. And fully conformable with this, is the theory and the actual order of the church in the period of which we now speak. We may appeal here even to Clement of Rome in the latter part of the first century, who in a memorable passage, (*Ep. I. ad Corinth. c. 42-44.*) urges the duty of submission to church rulers, on the ground of a divine order in their office, parallel with that of the Levitical priesthood under the Old Testament, of which God had shown himself so jealous through the ministry of his servant Moses.¹ To quote Ignatius on the same general point, may be taken as perfectly superfluous. It is not merely where he bears direct witness for episcopacy, that his testimony is of weight; the force of it lies rather in the universal tone of his several epistles. It is sometimes said, that the episcopal passages have the air of being interpolations, thrust into the text from a later age. But any one may readily see the contrary, who will take the trouble of reading the text with his own eyes, for the purpose of getting out of it its own sense instead of putting into it a sense to suit himself. Their is nothing whatever in these passages at variance with the reigning tone of the epistles, but on the contrary they are in full keeping with this throughout.² There is hardly a sentence or a line indeed

¹ "The apostles had their office from Christ," he tells us, "Christ from God; they were sent by him as he was sent by God. Both in right order according to God's will." Clothed with full power after his resurrection, they went forth and founded churches on all sides, appointing tried men to preside over them as bishops and deacons, which was only fulfilling the sense of ancient prophecy, Is. lx: 17. This they did, in virtue of their own commission, to prevent contentions such as they knew were likely to arise; and not only did they appoint those first officers, but "they made arrangement also for the future, that when these should die other approved men should succeed to their place."

² This is well shown by that most profound and acute critic, Dr. *Richard Rothe*, in his work entitled "*Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*," where the authority of these epistles, and the whole subject of the constitution of the early church, are handled in a truly masterly style.

in Ignatius, that is not in spirit fully opposite to Puritanism, on the great question of the church. He has in his mind always the mystical order of the creed, according to which the fact of the incarnation underlies in a real way the fact of the church, as the carrying out of the same wonder for faith. In correspondence with the real union of divinity and humanity in Christ, his mystical body must have a real historical and visible being in the world as well as an invisible spiritual character, and this must of necessity carry along with it in such view the attributes of unity and catholicity, as the signature of its superhuman authority. Hence the stress laid on the hierarchy, as the bond, not from below but from above, of that glorious *sacramentum unitatis* on which was felt to hang the virtue and value of all grace in the church besides. Hence the holy martyr's horror of all schism. Obedience to the church is, in his view, obedience to Christ; to be out of communion with the bishop, in rupture with the one altar he guards and represents, is to have no part at the same time in the kingdom of God.¹ The unity must be somatic, as well as spiritual.² To fall away from this bond, is taken to be a falling away to the same extent from the lively sense of the mystery of the incarnation, a species of Gnosticism which turned the flesh of the Son of God into a mere phantom, and so robbed the Gospel of its heavenly power. For those who resolve Christ in this way into a phantom or abstraction, according to Ignatius, make themselves in the end to be without either substance or strength; all true christian strength comes from an apprehension of the whole mystery here in view as something historically and enduringly real. With this agrees again, as all know, the teaching of Irenæus in the latter part of the second century, as it has come down to us particularly in his celebrated work against heretics; and the same views substantially are presented to us also by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria.

II. The contrary schemes of the church just noticed, involve with a sort of inward logical necessity different and contrary views also of the *ministry*, and of its relations to the body of the people. Puritanism makes the ministers of religion to be much like county or town officers, or sees in them at best only good religious counsellors and teachers, whom the people create

¹ Μη πλασασθε ἀδελφοί μου ἐν τῇ σκίζοντι ἀκολουθεῖν βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ πληροῦμαι, Ad Philad. c. 3.

² Ἦν ἑνωσις ἡ σωματικὴ τε καὶ πνευματικὴ, Ad Magnes. c. 1, 13.

for their own use and follow as far as to themselves may seem good. It spurns the whole idea of a divinely established hierarchy, drawing its rights and powers from heaven, and forming in its corporate character the bond of unity for the church, the ground of its perpetual stability, and the channel of all communications of grace to it from Him who is its glorified head. Every view of this sort runs counter to the democracy of the system, and does violence to its rationalism and common sense. It has no power constitutionally to believe in any really supernatural order reaching here below the time of the Apostles; and it must have accordingly the same guaranties for freedom precisely, which it is accustomed to ask and lean upon in the case of purely human and civil relations. Hence the vast account it makes of the popular element in all ecclesiastical interests and concerns, its zeal for the parity of the clergy, its deep seated hostility to the idea of the priesthood, as well as to all pontifical allusions or associations, in any connection with the work of the christian ministry.

But now how different from all such thinking, is the light in which the ministry is found to stand in the second century. We need not go into any minute examination of the ecclesiastical polity which then prevailed. The question is not primarily whether there were three orders of clergy, or two, or only one; whether the bishops of Ignatius were diocesan in the modern sense, or simply parochial; but this rather, What relation did the overseership of the church bear to the mass of its members? And this, we say confidently, was neither Congregational *nor* Presbyterian, in the established sense of these distinctions at the present time. Let any one look into the writers already named, especially Ignatius and Irenæus, so as to catch at all their general tone and spirit, and he will feel it to be no better than burlesque, when Dr. Bacon allows himself to transfer to the scene of Smyrna or Lyons, in the second century, the picture he himself gives us of what he takes to be the repristination of the primitive church in this latter city in our own day.* The imag-

* "The meeting which I attended was a meeting of the brotherhood for mutual conference and inquiry. It was held in a school-room, and very much resembled a Congregational church meeting in New England. There was, however, one obvious difference. Those brethren were not merely concerned with the working of a system defined and understood in all its details, and familiar to them from their childhood. With the New Testament in their hands, they were inquiring after principles and rules of church order; and the question which then chiefly occupied their attention, and seemed somewhat to divide their opinions, was whether the govern-

ination of any such ecclesiastical republicanism, is completely foreign we may say from the whole spirit of this ancient period. Only look at the way in which Irenæus speaks of the episcopate and the apostolical succession, as the grand bulwark of truth against all heresy and schism; not once or twice merely, but whenever the subject comes in his way; showing the view to be inseparably joined with the entire scheme of Christianity in his mind. It is not to be disguised moreover, that the episcopate is viewed by him as a general corporation, having its centre of unity in the church of Rome. Against the novelty of heretics, he appeals to the clear succession of the catholic sees generally from the time of the Apostles; but then sums all up, by singling out the Roman church, founded by the most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and having a certain principality for the church at large, as furnishing in its line of bishops a sure tradition of the faith held by the universal body from the beginning.² Take this system of church government as we may, it is the very reverse of all such independency and popularity as are made to be the basis of ecclesiastical order in New England. Congregationalism lays no such stress on the episcopate or overseership of the church, regarded as an organic corporation, bound together always by a common centre, and having authority by unbroken tradition from the Apostles. And just as little have we here the

ment of their church should be in part committed to a body of elders, or remain entire in the hands of the assembled brethren. As I listened to the discussions, I could not but admire the free and manly, yet fraternal spirit in which it was conducted. And as I saw what a school for the development of various intellectual gifts, as well as for the culture of Christian affection, that church had been under its simple democratic organization, I felt quite sure that those brethren, with all their confidence in their teachers, would not be easily persuaded to subvert a system to which they were already so greatly indebted, or to divest themselves of the right of freely debating and voting on all their interests and duties as a church."—"Rarely, have I enjoyed anything more than I enjoyed my visit to that missionary and apostolical church. Nor do I know where to look for a more satisfactory representation of the ideal and primitive Christianity, than in the city which was made illustrious so long ago by the labors of Irenæus, and by the martyrdom of Pothinus and Blandina."—*Letter from Lyons.*

* "Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones: maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, &c.—Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, &c."—*Adv. hæres. III. 3. §. 2.*

type of modern Presbyterianism. The bishops of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Irenæus, however small may have been their charges, were not simply Presbyterian pastors. They have altogether a different look, and hold an entirely different relation to the people over whom they preside. Their rule is not indeed lordly, but neither is it simply representative and democratic; it is patriarchal rather, but at the same time an actual episcopate or oversight, derived from the chief Shepherd, at once supreme and self-sacrificing, in the full spirit of 1 Pet. v: 1-4. The order altogether is that of a hierarchy. The pastors are at the same time priests; and pontifical ideas fall in with their ministry easily and naturally from every side. The altar at which they serve is not merely a cold metaphor; and the sacrifice they offer upon it is mystical indeed, but nevertheless awfully and sublimely real. In one word, the system contains in element and germ at least the whole theory of the church that is more fully presented to us afterwards, in the writings of Cyprian and Augustine. There is no contradiction between the two schemes. The first flows over without any sort of violence or effort into the last; and becomes hard to understand, only when inquisitorial theorists put it to the rack, for the purpose of forcing from it a sense and voice which are not its own.¹

III. This leads us naturally to the consideration of a third general and broadly palpable difference between Puritanism and the early church, that namely which appears in the view they take of the *holy sacraments*. The modern system owns no real mystery either in baptism or the Lord's supper. It takes them indeed for divine institutions; but the sense of them is altogether natural only and human. They carry in them no objective force, have no power whatever to present what they represent; they are taken to be signs only or pictures of a grace, which exists not in the sacraments themselves, but out of them and beyond them under a wholly different form. Any virtue they have is from the activity of the worshipper's mind, moved it may be by the Spirit of God to make good use of the outward and natural help to devotional thoughts and affections, which is thus placed within its reach. All beyond this is held to be superstition; and the sacramental system in particular of the Catholic church, as well as the whole doctrine of the real pres-

¹ This is shown, with what appears to us to be the most triumphant evidence, by Richard Rothe, in the great work to which we have before referred, *Die Anfänge d. chr. Kirche*, particularly in the third book.

ence in its Protestant form also, is denounced and discarded as a purely diabolical figment, brought in under the Papacy in complete contradiction to the original sense of the Gospel, and without the least ground or reason in the practice of the church as it stood in the beginning.

It might seem plain to any child, that if any such low view had prevailed in the second century, it must have required a miracle to place the entire church, in its doctrine of the sacraments, where we find it to be in the fourth century, or to lead it over even in half a dozen centuries to so astounding a tenet as that of transubstantiation, with like universal and at the same time profoundly noiseless and peaceful revolution. But the second century can easily enough speak here for itself. And so clear and full in truth is its voice on the whole subject, that we venture to say no one can listen to it attentively, having any sort of confidence at the same time in the true apostolicity of its faith, and not be inspired with a feeling of downright horror, in view of the deep yawning gulph by which this is found to be sundered from what we have just now seen to be the modern system. Right or wrong, Puritanism is in its sacramental doctrine a grand apostacy, not only from what Protestantism was designed to be in the beginning, but also from the faith of the early church as it stood in the days of Pothinus and Irenæus. The martyrs of Lyons must have drawn back aghast from the view of baptism and the holy eucharist now commonly prevalent in New England; while their venerable bishops, no doubt, would have placed it in one category with the numerous heresies of the time, that went directly to overthrow the real appearance of Christ in the flesh.

Passing over baptism, let us fix our attention on the sacrament of the blessed eucharist. Nothing can be clearer at first glance, than that the fathers of this period make vastly more of the institution than is at all answerable to the natural and simple light in which it is regarded by Puritanism. They lay great stress on its doctrinal significance, as being in some vital way related to the mystery of the incarnation, and conditioning the whole faith and life of the church; and they seldom refer to it, without bringing into view the idea of its mystical supernatural import. Ignatius takes the real presence of the eucharist to be organically related to the truth and realness of the Saviour's humanity, and upbraids the docetic Gnostics, (who acknowledged thus also the force of the connection,) with abstaining from the institution, because they would not believe that Christ had ever assumed anything more than the show of a human body.

"They refrain from the service," he writes, "on account of their not confessing that the eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father in his goodness raised from the dead. Contradicting the gift of God they die in their contention; but it would be their interest to love, so that they too might rise again."¹ In another place, (ad Ephes. c. 20.) Ignatius calls the eucharist the "medicine of immortality" (φάρμακον ἀθανασίας) and the "antidote of death" (ἀντιδοτον του μη ἀποθανειν); phrases that are sufficiently explained by the last clause of the foregoing quotation, where the risen flesh of the Saviour is made to be the power that is to reanimate also our mortal bodies. But if there were any doubt as to the doctrine of Ignatius here, or as to its agreement with the reigning faith of the church at the time, it must vanish certainly before the ample and plain testimony of Irenæus.

With this father again, the doctrine of the eucharist is made to be of extraordinary practical and theoretical account. It is not a circumstance merely in the general system of faith, but appears as a truly living and divinely efficacious link, between the mystery of the incarnation on one side and the coming resurrection of our bodies on another; showing plainly that these connections as suggested by Ignatius, were not fanciful or casual, but rooted in the reigning belief of the church. The Gnostics generally held the material world to be intrinsically evil, and so not capable of coming into any real union with the new creation by Christ. They would not allow accordingly that the Saviour took a real human body; and they could not admit of course then the resurrection of the body, in the case of his people. It was a principle with them, that the body as such constitutionally excluded the idea of immortality. Against these errors Irenæus affirms the goodness of the natural creation, the truth of Christ's incarnation, and the commensurateness of his redemption with the whole nature of man, as being able to save the body in the way of future resurrection no less than the soul. One grand source of argument is found in the mystery of the holy supper, which it is taken for granted that these heretics, in common with the church, acknowledged to be a bond of communication with Christ's substantial flesh and blood. However disposed they might be by their spiritualistic system to take these

¹ Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσέχης ἀπέχονται δια το μὴ ὁμολογεῖν, τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθεῖσαν, ἣν τὴ χρηστοτεῖτι ὁ πατήρ ἡγάγειν. Οἱ ἀντιλεγόντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ συζητοῦντες ἀποδυνασχοῦσι' συζημεῖς ἡ αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾶν, ἵνα καὶ ἀθανάτωσιν.—Ad Smyrn. c. 7.

terms in an improper and merely figurative sense, it seems that they were still compelled to yield here to the pressure of the catholic faith, and to admit thus an actual presence of the Saviour's glorified body, whatever that might be, in this sublime mystery; and no evidence could well be stronger than this, for the universal and vital authority of this faith in the church, itself at the time. To deny the possibility of the resurrection, according to Irenaeus, involves this consequence: "That neither the cup of the eucharist is the communication of his blood, nor the bread which we break the communication of his body; for it is not blood, unless it be from his veins and his flesh, and the rest of that human substance, by which he became truly the Word of God." Again: "Since we are members of him, and live from the natural creation, which he furnishes to us for this end, causing his sun to rise and sending rain according to his own pleasure; he has proclaimed the cup which is of the natural creation to be his own blood, from which he moistens our blood, and has established the bread which is of this creation to be his own body from which he nourishes our bodies." And still farther: "When therefore the natural cup and bread, by receiving the word of God at consecration, are made the eucharist of the blood and body of Christ, by which the substance of our flesh is advanced and upheld, how can they deny that the flesh is capable of the gift of God, which is eternal life, since it is nourished by the blood and body of Christ and is his member? Even as the blessed Apostle says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, *We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones*; not speaking of the spiritual and invisible man, (for spirit has neither bones nor flesh.) but of that constitution which is truly human, consisting of flesh and nerves and bones, which is nourished from the cup that is his blood and from the bread that is his body. And as the slip of the vine laid in the ground brings forth fruit in its time, and the grain of wheat falling into the earth and undergoing decomposition rises manifoldly by God's Spirit, through which all things are upheld; which then by the wisdom of God come to be for the use of man, and receiving the word of consecration become the eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ: so also our bodies nourished by this, and laid away in the earth and dissolved into it shall rise again in their time, the Word of God bestowing the resurrection upon them to the glory of God the Father."¹ In another place, Iren-

¹ Adv. haeres. v. 2, §. 2, 3.

aeus calls upon the heretics either to give up the errors now noticed, or else to abstain from the eucharist, as some of the earlier Docetae actually did in the time of Ignatius, according to what we have seen before. "How can they say," he exclaims, "that the flesh perishes and attains not to life, which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord? Let them change their view, or refrain from offering these things. Our view, on the contrary, agrees with the eucharist, and the eucharist again confirms our view. For we offer to him things that are his own, setting forth congruously the communion and unity, and confessing the resurrection of the flesh and spirit. For as the bread from the earth, when it has received the invocation of God, is now no longer bread, but the eucharist consisting of two things, an earthly and a celestial; so also our bodies receiving the eucharist are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to everlasting life."¹

So much for the real presence of the Saviour's glorified humanity in the holy supper. Can there be any doubt in the face of these passages, whether such a mystery was held by the early church, or whether it was considered to be of necessary force as a part of the faith originally delivered to the saints? We see too, how the service was regarded as carrying in it the force of a sacrifice or oblation, analogous with the offerings of the altar under the Old Testament; an idea which Irenæus elsewhere utters in full and distinct terms, applying to the case, in the spirit of later centuries, the memorable passage, Mal. i: 10, 11, where it is said: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." But what student of antiquity needs to be told, that the eucharist in this early period carried in it a significance and solemnity, of which no rational account can be given, except on the ground that such powers as those now mentioned were supposed to go along with its celebration?²

We inquire not now into the truth of this old sacramental doctrine; neither is it necessary to define in what mode precisely it understood the mystery of the real presence to take place. It is enough to know, that the mystery itself was universally

¹ Adv. haeres. iv. 18. §. 5.

² See an interesting and clear representation of the testimony of Irenæus on the whole subject in *Möhler's Patrologie*, pp. 377-391.

received, as of fundamental consequence in the christian system ; and that the doctrine therefore stood in no sort of harmony with the common Puritan view of the present time. The martyrs of Lyons and Vienne died in full hope of the resurrection ; but this hope was based on a species of realistic sacramentalism here, which we feel very sure would bring upon them now through all New England the charge of gross superstition, and leave no room for them whatever within the magic ring of its "evangelical sects."

IV. A like wide contrast between the early system and the modern comes into view, in the next place, when we look at their different theories in regard to the *rule of faith*.

It is a primary maxim with Puritanism, that the Bible alone is the rule and ground of all religion, of all that men are required to believe or do in the service of God. In this sacred volume, we are told, God has been pleased to place his word in full, by special inspiration, as a supernatural directory for the use of the world to the end of time ; for the very purpose of providing a sufficient authority for faith, that might be independent of all human judgment and will. If it be asked, how the Bible is to be interpreted and made available as a rule of faith, the answer is that every man must interpret it as he best can for his own use, under the guidance of God's Spirit, and with such helps as he may happen to have at his command. In other words, the ultimate tribunal for the exposition of God's word is private judgment. No other tribunal can be regarded as of any legitimate authority or right. All tradition especially, pretending in any way to over-rule private judgment, is to be firmly rejected as something inimical to the rights of reason and conscience. What men can see to be taught in the scriptures is to be of force for them as revelation, and what they cannot see to be so taught there is to be of no such force. The great matter accordingly is to place the bible in every man's hands, and to have him able to read it, that he may then follow it in his own way. The idea seems to be, that the bible was published in the first place as a sort of divine formulary or text book for the world to follow in matters of religion, and that the church rested on no other ground in the beginning for its practices or doctrines, appealing to it and building upon it in a perfectly free and original way after the fashion of our modern sects ; in which view it is to be counted still the foundation and pillar of the truth, so that the dissemination of its printed text throughout the world, without note or comment, is the one thing specially needful and specially to be relied upon for the full victory of Christianity, from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.

This theory has many difficulties. To place a divine text at the mercy of private judgment, looks very much like making it a mere nose of wax. Men deal not thus with the authority of other laws and constitutions. All the world over the sense of written statutes is ruled more or less by the power of an unwritten living tradition, (such as the "common law" of England and this country,) which at the same time is applied to the case by some public tribunal, and *not* by every man at his own pleasure. So deeply seated indeed is this order in our very nature, that it is never surmounted even by those who in the case before us pretend to set it aside. Puritanism never in truth allows the bible *alone* to be the religion of Protestants. Every sect has its tradition, its system of opinions and habits, handed forward by education, just as much as the Catholic church itself, through which as a medium the written word is studied and understood at every point. In no other way could it exist as a historical body at all. The private judgment of a good Presbyterian is always carried, from infancy on to old age, in the bosom of a general Presbyterian stream of thought, that has been flowing in its own separate channel from the origin of this communion in the days of John Knox; and the same thing precisely is true of the Methodists, as well as of all the other scores of sects that in as many variant ways follow the same infallible rule of faith and practice. It cannot well escape observation again, that the bible itself lends no sort of countenance to the hypothesis, which turns it thus in such abstract style into the sum total of all God's mind and will, mechanically laid down for man's use, like the directions for the building of the tabernacle in the book of Exodus. It never speaks of itself as being either a system of divinity or a confession of faith. It has no such form, but shows as clearly as possible an altogether different construction and design. Nay more, it is perfectly certain from the New Testament itself, that Christianity was *not* made to rest on any such foundation in the beginning, but on a living authority, which started in Christ and passed over from him to the ministry of the church. This is as plain as words could well make it, from Matth. xvi: 18, 19; Matth. xxviii: 18, 20; Eph. ii: 19, 22, and 1 Tim. iii: 15, 16. On the basis of the apostolical commission, backed by heavenly miraculous authority, and entering into no negotiation whatever with the world's private judgment, the early church was in fact planted and built throughout the Roman empire. The books of the New Testament came afterwards as part and parcel of the glorious revelation committed to her hands; and it was not till the fourth century, as we have before seen,

•

that the arduous and responsible task of settling the canon was brought to a complete close, although the main parts of it were acknowledged and in general use probably before the middle of the second.

These are difficulties, we say, which from the Puritan standpoint it is by no means easy to meet. But we do not press them at present. What we wish to hold up to view is the clearly evident fact, that the church of the second century was not Puritan but Catholic, in its conception of the rule of faith, concurring here in its whole habit of thought with the order that actually prevailed, as just now stated, in the first planting of Christianity in the world. The sacred books are indeed referred to with high veneration in this age, as they are in all subsequent times of the Catholic church, but never under any such abstract and independent view, as they are made to carry in the private-judgment sect system of the present day. Of a bible, out of which every man was to fetch the doctrines and practices of religion as he best could with the bucket of his own common sense, these early Christians had not so much as the most remote imagination. They own the inspiration of the scriptures and appeal to them as the norm and measure of their faith; but it is only and always as they are taken to be comprehended in that general tradition of infallible truth, which had come down from the Apostles in a living way by the church. The bible was for them the word of God, not on the outside of the church, and as a book dropped from the skies for all sorts of men to use in their own way, but in the bosom of the church alone, and in organic union with that great system of revelation of which this was acknowledged to be the pillar and ground. Sundered from that organism, cut off from the living stream of catholic tradition, the holy oracles in the hands of heretics were considered as shorn of all their force. Such men as Irenæus and Tertullian had no idea of sitting down, and debating points of doctrine with the Gnostics out of the bible, in any way owning at all their right to appeal to it as an independent rule; just as little as it ever entered into their heads probably to put the people, "with the New Testament in their hands," on inquiring "into the principles and rules of church government," after the democratic fashion of the nineteenth century. They will not allow the heretics to put their cause on any ground of this sort; they cut them off by prescription, that is, by the clear title of the regular church to the succession or tradition of Christianity, as it had been handed down, under the broad seal of its original charter, from the time of the Apostles. Some notice has been taken be-

fers of the way, in which Irenæus appeals to the known apostolical succession of the bishops in his time, and their collective voice in favor of the truth, bringing all to centre and culminate in Rome as the principal see. This constitution, and no other, is with him the organ of unity both in doctrine and government; all else is heresy and schism. "It is necessary to hearken to the presbyters in the church," he tells us (*Adv. haer. iv. c. 20*), who have the succession from the Apostles, and along with the succession of the episcopate have received the certain gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father." Again (*iv. c. 33, §. 8.*): "The true knowledge (*γνώσις*) is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient constitution (*συστήμα*) of the church in the whole world, and the character of the body of Christ according to the successions of the bishops, to whom they (the Apostles) have committed the church in every place." The paths of heresy are many and variable, but the doctrine of the church is one and unchanging all over the world; "she preserves the traditional faith, though spread throughout the earth, with the greatest care, as if she occupied but one house; and believes it, as if she had but one soul and one heart; and proclaims, teaches, hands it forward, with marvellous agreement, as if she had but one mouth. The languages used are indeed different, but the matter of the tradition is still one and the same" (*i. 10. 2. comp. v. 20. §. 1.*). Again (*iii. 4. §. 1.*): "If the Apostles had left us no writings, ought we not still to follow the rule of that tradition, which they handed over to those to whom they committed the churches? To this rule many nations of barbarians do hold in fact, which believe in Christ, and have his salvation inscribed by the Holy Ghost without ink or paper on their hearts, carefully following the tradition &c." Specially striking is the passage, *L. iii. c. 24. §. 1.*, where this tradition is made to carry in it a divine element, rendering it infallible; gathering itself up into the mystery of that faith "which we have received and hold from our church, and which the Spirit of God continually renovates, like a precious jewel in a good casket, imparting to it the quality of his own perennial youth." Such is the testimony of Irenæus. Tertullian is, if possible, still stronger in the same churchly strain. He will know nothing of any private argumentation, from the scriptures or any other source; all must yield to the smashing weight of ecclesiastical tradition. Christianity is built, not on a book, but on a living system handed down from the day of Pentecost. Truth is fellowship with the churches derived by regular succession from the Apostles; they have collectively but one doctrine; and whatever disowns this

order, is without farther examination to be rejected as false. His whole tract on the *Prescription of Heretics* rests on this view, and might be quoted here with effect. The heretics have no right to appeal to the scriptures. These belong only to the church. She may say to them: 'Who are you? Whence do you come? What business have you strangers with my property? By what right are you, Marcion, felling my trees? By what authority are you, Valentine, turning the course of my streams? Under what pretence are you, Apelles, removing my land-marks? The estate is mine; why do you other persons presume to work it and use it at your pleasure? The estate is mine; I have the ancient, prior possession of it; have the title deeds from the original owners. I am the heir of the Apostles; they made their will, with all proper solemnities, in my favor, while they disinherited and cast you off as strangers and enemies.'" Tertullian had no idea of making exegesis the mother of faith.'

Is it necessary to say, that the faith of the second century, as here portrayed, is something very different from the reigning evangelical scheme of the present day? No honest student of history, we think, can fail to see and confess, that the doctrine of Irenæus and Tertullian on the relation of the bible to the church is essentially one and the same with that which is clearly presented afterwards by Chrysostom and Augustine, and that in sound at least it is very much like the Catholic doctrine as opposed to Protestantism in modern times.

V. Take next the *order of doctrine*. Single truths have their proper value and force, not merely in themselves separately taken, but in the place they occupy as parts of the whole system to which they belong. Much depends then on the order in which they are held. The doctrinal scheme of the early church has come down to us in the Apostles' Creed. Into the question of the origin of this symbol, it is not necessary now to enter. Its universal prevalence in the fourth century is itself argument enough for a thinking mind, that it must have come down from time immemorial before in substantially the same form; but independently of this, it is abundantly plain from the writers of the second century, that the whole theology of that period was shaped in the mind of the church on this model at least, and on no other. But this at once conditions and determines its uni-

¹ See Rothe's work before quoted; also Mühler's *Patrologie*, pp. 344-357, 737-748.

versal character, setting it in close affinity with the later theology of the Catholic church, and placing it in broad contrariety to the Puritan scheme of doctrine as we now meet with it in New England. Puritanism, by its abstract spiritualistic character, has lost the power to a great extent of understanding both the old creed, and the catholic theology of which it was the foundation; and with a certain feeling of superior maturity is disposed generally to put the whole away as somewhat childish and out of date. The objection is not so much to single points in themselves considered; for most of these may be translated into some good modern sense; but it holds rather against the order in which they are put together, the architecture of the creed, its reigning animus, its too much of one thing and its too little or nothing at all of another. The sound of it is uncomfortably mystical, sacramental and churchly. Puritanism knows very well in its inmost soul, that no *such* creed is the symbol exactly of that form of belief which it now parades as its own, and as being at the same time the only true and perfect sense of the bible. It would never have produced any creed of this sort. It sees all truth in a different order, and holds it in quite other proportions and relations. When it undertakes to give us a creed in fact, (as it is ready to do commonly at a moment's warning and to any order,) the product is something very different from the ancient symbol of the Apostles.'

¹ See an article entitled "Puritanism and the Creed," in the *Mercersburg Review* for November 1849, published at the same time also as a separate tract. It will be remembered, that the *Puritan Recorder*, of Boston, plainly acknowledged "that the Creed and Puritanism have not a kindred spirit," and that only by courtesy it found a place originally in Puritan formularies and catechisms. "Its life and spirit," it was said, "never entered into the life of the Puritan churches; and consequently it now exists among us as some fossil relic of by-gone ages. And we look with a sort of pity upon those who are laboring to infuse life into it, and to set it up as a living ruler in the church. We are free to confess, that this Creed has forsaken the Puritans, and gone over to become the idol and strength of all branches of anti-puritanism. And there are good reasons; for Puritanism builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines." It should have been said rather, that Puritanism has forsaken the Creed; breaking away at the same time from the faith of the universal church as it stood in the second century, and while it accepts the bible from the hands of this same church, coolly turning round and saying to it: You never understood your own scriptures; we know what they mean, and you and your creed may go to the tomb of the Capulets. We have never heard of any repudiation of this monstrous sentiment, on the part of the interest thus represented by the *Puritan Recorder*, and take it for granted therefore that it is nothing more than a true picture after all of what must be considered here a general falling away from the *regula fidei* of the primitive church.

There is a real difference, as regards the *tout ensemble* of Christian doctrine between the Patristic system and Protestantism in its original proper form. More than one has felt something of the experience given in the following striking passage from Thiersch. "It is a strange impression," he remarks in his work on the *Canon*, p. 280, "that the church fathers make on one who first enters on the study of them, under the full force of a merely Protestant consciousness. So fared it with the writer himself. Nurtured on the best that the old Protestant books of devotion contain, and trained theologically in the doctrines and interpretations of the orthodox period of Protestantism, he turned finally to the fathers. Well does he remember how strange it appeared to him in the beginning, to find here nothing of those truths, which formed the spring of his whole religious life, nothing of the way the sinner must tread to arrive at peace and an assurance of the Divine favor, nothing of Christ's merit as the only ground of forgiveness, nothing of continual repentance and ever new recourse to the fountain of free grace, nothing of the high confidence of the justified believer. Instead of this, he found that all weight was laid on the incarnation of the Divine Logos, on the right knowledge of the great object of worship, on the objective mystery of the Trinity and of Christ's Person, on the connection between creation, redemption, and the future restoration of the creature along with the glorification also of man's body, on the freedom of man and on the reality of the operations of Divine grace in the sacraments. But he was enabled gradually to live himself into this old mode of thought, and without giving up what is true and inalienable in the Lutheran Protestant consciousness, to correct its oneness by a living appropriation of the theology of the fathers. He soon saw, that over against the errors of the present time, its pantheism and fatalism, its spiritualism and misapprehension of the significance of the corporeal, the church needs a decided taking up again of what is true in the Patristic scheme of thought, and an assimilation of her whole life to the ancient model—in spirit and idea first, as outward relations are not at once under human control. This old primitive church stood out to his view more and more in its full splendor, in its sublime beauty, of which only fragmentary lineaments are to be recognised in the churches, confessions and sects, of the present day."

Thiersch here finds Protestantism itself materially different from early Christianity; while he holds it however, in its legitimate character, capable of a living conjunction with the ancient faith, though carrying in itself a fearful tendency to fall away

from it altogether; a tendency, which is now getting the mastery of it in truth in many places, and that needs to be counteracted by a return to former ideas. What he has his eye upon immediately is the rationalism surrounding him in Germany. But the tendency is not limited to that form of open unbelief. It lies in all unchurchly religion. It animates the whole sect system. It forms the proper soul of Puritanism. This is not original Protestantism, carrying in it the *possibility* merely of a full dissociation from the mind of the ancient church; but it is this possibility actually realized. It is a growth completely to the one side, which refuses now all organic agreement with the trunk of Christian doctrine as this stood in the beginning. The two schemes of thought are quite apart, and can never be made to fit together with any sort of symmetry or ease. Puritanism, by its very constitution, ignores and abjures the *old* sense of the Apostles' Creed.

VI. Look finally at the subject of *faith in miracles*. It is well known, that the early church not only believed firmly in the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, as well as in those of the Old Testament, but had a most firm persuasion also that the same power was still actively displayed in her own bosom, and that it lay in her commission in truth to look for its revelation, as occasion might require, "always to the end of the world." It is generally admitted even among Protestants not openly rationalistic, (though some feel it necessary with the celebrated Dr. Conyers Middleton to take different ground through fear of Popery,) that many supernatural signs and wonders were wrought in the service of Christianity during the first three ages. But what we have to do with just now is not so much the actual truth of these miracles, as the state of mind on the part of the church itself, by which they were considered possible, and which led to their being readily received on all sides as nothing more than the natural and proper fruit of the new religion. The apologists appeal to them boldly as notorious facts. Both Irenæus and Tertullian challenge the heretics to prove their authority by miracles, as the church did hers in every direction; and the proofs mentioned are such as giving sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, casting out devils, healing sicknesses, and even raising the dead to life. To question the fact of miracles in the church, would have been in this period equivalent to downright infidelity. It lay in the whole sense the church then had of the realness and nearness of the supernatural world, in her felt apprehension of the living communion in which she stood with it through Christ, that such demonstrations of its

presence should be regarded as most perfectly possible, and in some sort as a matter of course. Her idea of *faith* was such, as of itself involved this from the very start.

But who needs to be told, how different from all this the tone of thought is that now pervades the universal empire of Puritanism? The difference is not in the mere want of miracles; though that is something too for a thoughtful mind; it appears rather, under a more alarming and affecting view, in the want of power to exercise faith in anything of the sort. Puritanism pretends indeed to great faith in the invisible and supernatural; just as the Gnostics did also in ancient times. But its faith, like theirs, is in the language of Ignatius wonderfully asomatic and unreal. The action of the supernatural is remanded by it to the world of mere thought. God works miracles now in the souls of his people; and away back in the shadow land of the past, he wrought them by special dispensation also under a more outward form. But the age of such proper wonders is long since past. It is unsafe to speak of them after the third century, and not very wise to lay much stress on them even in the second. All pretensions to anything of the sort may be set down at once, and without any examination, as purely "lying wonders." Such we all know to be the reigning habit of thought here, with this popular system. Dr. Middleton's theory suits it to a title, and is drawn as it were from its very soul. Puritanism has no faith in miracles answerable at all to what prevailed in the early church, no power we may say to believe them in the same way. Its inward relation to the world from which miracles come, is by no means the same. The difference is not in the judgment exercised in regard to this particular miracle or that, but in the total frame of the mind with regard to the universal subject. This is not faith, but absolute scepticism, just as complete as anything we meet with in Gibbon, Voltaire, or Hume.¹

The martyrs of Lyons knew nothing of such scepticism. It required another sense of the "powers of the world to come,"

¹ Both the N. Y. Observer and the N. Y. Churchman, representing but too faithfully we fear the spirit of their respective communions, noticed not long since with pure derision a sermon by Dr. Forbes, the late convert to Romanism, in defence of the idea that Christ has continued to fulfil his promise of miracles in the later ages of the church. The misery of all this is, not that this or that wonder of popular belief in the Catholic church may be shown to be false and ridiculous, but that the basis on which alone any such popular beliefs are made possible, the sense namely of the supernatural order of Christianity as a real and ever present fountain of the miraculous in the church, is rationalistically undermined and destroyed.

to carry so many simple and plain persons, with such triumphant courage, through the scenes that are described in the account of their martyrdom. They had no difficulty in admitting the reality of signs and wonders in the church. Nay, these had place in connexion with their own sufferings, and are reported by Irenæus, (the supposed writer of the account,) as carrying in them nothing incredible whatever. Blandina, a weak slave, was regarded as being upheld, quite beyond the common course of nature, in the terrible torments through which she was made to pass, from the break of day till night. The deacon Sanctus was tortured with hot plates of brass and in other ways, till his body became so covered with wounds and bruises that the very figure of it was lost; a few days after which he was brought out again, when it was supposed that the inflammation of his sores would cause him, under the repetition of the same cruelties, either to yield at once or expire. But "to the amazement of all, his body under the latter torments recovered its former strength and shape, and the exact use of all his limbs was restored; so that by this miracle of the grace of Jesus Christ, what was designed as an additional pain, proved an absolute and effectual cure." The martyrs appeared to move in a perfect nimbus of supernatural grace; even "their bodies sent forth such an agreeable and pleasant savor, as gave occasion to think that they used perfumes." The wild beasts of the amphitheatre, to which she was exposed, could not be provoked to touch Blandina. One of the martyrs "had a revelation" in regard to another, which this last made it his business dutifully to follow. What remained of the bodies, after the terrible tragedy, was burned to ashes, and thrown into the waters of the Rhone; but it was believed, that a part of these ashes was afterwards miraculously recovered, and the relics were deposited under the altar of the church which anciently bore the name of the Apostles of Lyons.

We say nothing of the credibility of these statements, nothing of the opinion we should have of what they pretend to describe. We hold them up simply as a picture of the mind that was in the church in the days of Pothinus and Irenæus; and in view

¹ It is related in the acts of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, written by the church of Smyrna, that when fire was set to the pile prepared to burn him the "flames forming themselves into an arch, like the sails of a ship swelled with the wind, gently encircled the body of the martyr, which stood in the middle, resembling not roasted flesh, but purified gold or silver, appearing bright through the flames; and his body sending forth such a fragrance, that we seemed to smell precious spices."

of it we have no hesitation in saying, that Dr. Bacon is altogether mistaken, when he finds its *facsimile*, either in Mr. Fisch's evangelical congregation of the present Lyons, or under the keen sharp features of Puritanism in any part of New England.

It would be easy to extend this contrast to other points. Veneration for the *relics* of deceased saints comes into view, as far back as our eye can reach. The bones of Ignatius, who was martyred at Rome under Trajan in the beginning of the second century, were carefully gathered up after his death, we are told, and carried back to Antioch his episcopal see. According to Chrysostom, they were borne in triumph on the shoulders of all the cities through Asia Minor. In Antioch they were placed finally in a church distinguished by his name, which St. Chrysostom encourages people in his day to visit, as having been to many the means of undoubted help both spiritually and corporally. In the case of Polycarp, the church of Smyrna writes that the malice of the devil was exerted to prevent his relics being carried off by the Christians; "for many desired to do it, to show their respect to his body." At the suggestion of the Jews, the proconsul was advised not to give the body into their hands, lest they should pass from the worship of the crucified one to the worship of Polycarp; "not knowing," say the acts, "that we can never forsake Christ, nor adore any other, though we love the martyrs, as his disciples and imitators, for the great love they bore their king and master." The corpse accordingly was reduced to ashes. "We afterwards took up the bones," the church adds, "more precious than the richest jewels or gold, and deposited them decently in a place, at which may God grant us to assemble with joy, to celebrate the birthday of the martyr." How different all this is from the spirit of modern Puritanism, even a child may see and feel. But the veneration for relics is itself only the proof and sign of a great deal more, embraced in the article of the "communion of saints" as it was held in the early church, every vestige of which has disappeared from the thinking of this later system. It is equally evident again, that the church of the second century attributed a peculiar merit to the state of celibacy and virginity, embraced for the glory of God and in the service of religion, which falls in fully with the tone of thought we find afterwards established in the Roman Catholic communion, but is as much at war as can well be imagined with the entire genius of Puritanism in every form and shape. It is not necessary, however, to push the comparison any further, in the consideration of these or of other kindred points. Our general purpose is abundantly answered, our cause more than

made out, by the topics of proof and illustration already presented.

The Puritan hypothesis, we now repeat, is false. There never was any such period of unchurchly evangelicalism as it assumes, in the history of early Christianity. Its whole dream of a golden age, answerable to its own taste and fashion, after the time of the New Testament and back of what it takes to be the grand apostacy that comes into view in the third century, is as perfectly baseless as any vision could well be. It rests upon mere air. It has not a syllable of true historical evidence in its favor; while the universal drift of proof is directly against it. Those then who will have it that New England Puritanism is the true image of what Christianity was at the start, and that the church tendency as it appears in universal force afterwards was from the start a corruption only, must take still higher ground than even this dizzy imagination; they must make up their mind, with the heroic Baptists, to look upon the history of the church as a grand falling away from its original design and type, as soon as it passed out of the hands of the Apostles, and long before the last of these in fact had gone to his rest. To this the theory comes in the end; and with the great body of those who hold it, this probably is the sense that always lurks in it at the bottom. But we need have no hesitation surely in saying, that every view of *this* sort is fatal to the credibility of the Gospel. It is only Gnosticism in disguise.

Our faith in the realness of Christianity will not allow us to bear the thought, that it fell from the very outset into the gulph-stream of a total apostacy, which carried the universal church, without resistance or knowledge, right onward always to the shipwreck of a thousand years—while Christ was showing himself by infallible signs both present and awake in the vessel, and miracles of faith and zeal prevailed on every side. It will not do; the whole supposition is monstrous. Puritanism is mistaken. It is a thousand times safer to interpret the meaning of Christianity from its own actual history in the beginning, than it is to sit at the feet now of any such modern authority, spinning the sense of it from the clouds. As to the likelihood of apostacy and wholesale error, in the main difference between the two forms of teaching, we believe the chances to be immeasurably in favor of antiquity and against the modern authority. It is far easier to believe Puritanism an apostacy, in its rejection of the *mystery* of the church and its sacraments, than it is to brand the universal faith of the second and third centuries with any such character, for the acknowledgment of this mystery as

something quite above the range of reason and common sense. We choose to go here with the early church. We do not believe that it fell into apostacy, as a whole, from the very outset of its course; that it mistook fundamentally the sense and meaning of the faith delivered to it by the Apostles; that it was almost immediately overpowered by a new and foreign idea, a "mystery of iniquity" that turned it finally into the synagogue of Satan. We detest and abhor any imagination of this sort; and pray God that our children may be kept from every such miserable tradition, as a true snare of the Devil that looks directly to rationalism and infidelity. There were faults and corruptions no doubt in the history of the church; but there was no such falling away from its own proper and primitive idea, as Puritanism finds it necessary constantly to assert. The reigning course of Christianity was right, and in full conformity with the will of Him who so visibly presided over it "on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The habit of doctrine and worship in which such men as Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyprian stood, which animated the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, and glowed in the seraphic ardor of Polycarp and Ignatius, must have been in the main, not diabolical, not superstitious, but true to the genius of the Gospel as it was "first spoken by the Lord and confirmed by them that heard him—God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." This implies of course that even the Papacy itself, *towards* which at least the whole system was carried with intrinsic necessity from the beginning, came in with reason and right, and had a mission to fulfil in the service of Christianity that could not have been fulfilled as well in any other way. No one indeed can study the history of the church soberly, it seems to us, without seeing this in the actual course of events. The grand bulwark of the true religion, through the whole period of the middle ages, was beyond all question the ecclesiastical organization that centered in the popes or bishops of Rome. Without this, the church would have fallen to pieces, hundreds of years before the Reformation. Only suppose the Papacy to have been overwhelmed by Mohammedanism, or by the German emperors, or by the wild fury of the Albigenses and other such Manichean sects, and what would there have been left of the glorious mystery of Christianity as it first stood, either to reform or mend in the sixteenth century?

If the cause of Protestantism then is to be successfully maintained, it must be on some other ground than the common Puri-

tan assumption, that it is just what Christianity was in the beginning, and that all variations from it in antiquity are to be set to the account of a devilish apostacy, of which Popery was at last the consummation and end. Come what may of the Reformation, there are certain general maxims of faith here which we can never safely renounce. We must hold fast to the divine origin of the church, and to its divine continuity from the beginning down to the present time. We must see and admit, that Protestantism is no return simply to Primitive Christianity. Its connection with this is *through* the Roman Catholic church only, as the real continuation of the older system. In no other view can it be acknowledged, as the historical and legitimate succession of this ancient faith. This implies, however, that the life of Protestantism must be one with the life of the church as it stood previously. It is to be taken as different from this indeed in the rejection of many accidental corruptions, but not in distinctive substance and spirit. Its doctrines and habits must be felt to grow forth, with true inward vitality, from the faith that has been accredited as divine from the beginning, by the promise and miraculous providence of Christ. Puritanism then, by abjuring this historical and organic relationship to the ancient church, does what it can in truth to ruin the cause of genuine Protestantism. It brings in another Gospel. It throws us on the terrible dilemma: "Either Ancient Christianity was intrinsically false, or Protestantism is a bold imposture"; for it makes this last to be the pure negation and contradiction of the first. But when it comes to this, what sound mind can pause in its choice? To create such a dilemma, we say then, is to fight against the Reformation. Puritanism, carrying upon its hard front these formidable horns, is no better than treason and death to Protestantism.

J. W. N.

TRAPPER'S LIFE.

THE Anglo Saxon era in North America resembles a magnificent rehearsal. It presents in the form of an abridgement the prominent features of the progress of society, from the beginning until the present time; it gives social phases of every cast, from a simple to a highly civilized state. The majestic romance of time has been dramatized, and America affords to the world-audience the boards upon which the scenes of the great human play, embracing centuries at one lifting of the curtain, are represented. We greet in our western hemisphere the rejuvenescence of the old world, and we trace with living eyes the enactment of the human story from its beginning. Like the days of the Creation, or the weeks of the prophet Daniel, time, in our plot, is the symbolization of its greater self, and the condensed statement of the present is a glowing miniature-show of ages. In this cosmoramic exhibition, we may see at once upon the platform all the several degrees of civilization clearly displayed by the Anglo Saxon, from that of the semi-civilized trapper at the one limit to that of the polished citizen at the other. Geographical gradations here correspond to the gradations of time in the old European world. The meditative eye, as it passes from the Rocky Mountains to the cities of the Atlantic, may survey a line of social progression, coincident in the main with the course of progress that marked those vast transition periods of society, respectively represented in the history of man by Hercules, Ulysses, Themistocles and Pericles: those periods, whose marvellous and mystic phases the kindred genius of ancient Greece has so charmingly embroidered upon the tapestry of history.

Human nature, as it were glad of the chance, blithely accepts the offer of providence here, and returns to its primitive normal usages. The yearnings expressed by Ponce-de-Leon are gratified in a more general sense, and man is permitted to sojourn again in the childhood experiences of his nature. He assumes again, not in frolic, each mould and aspect he has ever worn, and thus confirms in some sort the doctrine of the Platonic year.

The American trapper has dropped upon the earth after his time. His splendid physical heroism is fitted for an epical era—an era of myth. Had Kit Carson and Bill Williams flourished in the heroic ages, they would have matched Theseus and Idas in magnificence of exploit:—they would have been ranked by following generations with the demi-gods for their shining

deeds, and have had their apotheosis registered with that of Castor and Pollux in the bright enduring heavens.

We propose to make some observations on the character and life of the Trapper. He will soon become the property of history,—a phenomenon of the past. The living fact he presents will hardly survive the living generation. The economy of the times, in its unblushing researches, has not respected even the pitiful interests and dearly-bought earnings of this recluse of the great West. The substitution of the fur-seal and nutria, and the preparation of the skins of other less valuable fur-bearing animals, together with the unlimited use of silk in the manufacture of hats, are making every year the trapping of beaver an object of less consideration. Already many of this class have cast away their traps, and are constructing adobe hovels along the outskirts of the Mexican settlements, or beginning to upturn the virgin soil in distant view of the Mormons. “The depreciation in the value of beaver skins has thrown the great body of trappers out of employment, and there is a general tendency among the mountain men to settle in the fruitful valleys of the Rocky Mountains. Already the plow has turned up the soil within sight of Pike’s Peak, and a hardy pioneer, an Englishman, has led the way to the Great Salt Lake, where a settlement of mountaineers has even now been formed, three thousand miles from the frontier of the United States.”¹ Again: “The demand for the trapper’s services now is not as it once was. The price of furs has depreciated so much as to drive him to other engagements. Even since 1838, all who could have been abandoning this mode of life, and Oregon and California have opened rare opportunities for the adventurous spirits of the Plains.”²

The domains of the trapper are but ill-defined in their spacious outlines. In general they embrace all that immense area of mountain and plain lying between the States and the Pacific. The southern term of this vast tract gradually loses itself amid the wide-sown settlements of Northern Mexico. The ancient missions of the Jesuits and Franciscans, together with the recently formed gold colonies in California, and the settlements on the Columbia, limit its approaches to the western ocean. Its northern frontier vacillates far within the confines of that shadowy unexplored realm of impenetrable forests and frozen lakes, clos-

¹ Mexico and the Rocky Mountains, by S. F. Ruxton, 1849.

² Letter of a Missouri Gentleman, August 21st, 1851.

ed to all civilization, which is known only on the maps as being a part of the great British empire. In this magnificent field of nature, extending through twenty degrees of latitude, the Blackfeet, Crows, Sioux, Pawnees, Camanches and other ferocious tribes, on the one side of the Sierra Madre and Rocky Mountains, and the Apaches, Utahs and Shoshones, on the other, wander at will. This territory, in all its length and breadth, is the trapper's hunting ground and home. Its mountains and forests are traversed by him in every direction. Its rivers, and smaller confluent streams, are searched downward their whole length from their sources, and trapped for beaver. Many hundreds of these men, employed by the different fur companies are dispersed singly and in pairs over this whole region.¹ This free imperial range, illimitable as it seems, has been greatly disturbed, the last few years, by the torrent of emigration drawn through its centre, in consequence of the national acquisitions from Mexico, the western localization of Mormonism, and the gold discoveries.

The habits of the American trapper display an entire harmony with his condition and circumstances. By a strange transmutation, the civilized rudiments of his character have become the nutrient soil of barbarous developments, like those ancient ruins of Yucatan over which a wild tropical vegetation exhibits its most sturdy growth. His life is wholly removed from the restraints of society, and those unwritten conventional laws which regulate the thousand proprieties of conduct, which adjust the outward moral tone and aspect of human intercourse, and give to the deportment of man its social charm and polish, are as unknown to him as the institutes of Calvin. His character has taken its hues from the complexion of surrounding scenes, and modeled in the image of savage nature betrays a striking combination of simplicity and ferocity. The animal food taken almost raw, upon which he wholly subsists, tends to blunt his finer sensibilities, and to promote the truculence of his nature. His wants are few. His buckskin costume is everlasting in its wear. With his rifle in hand, upon the prairie or mountain height, he is like the reaper in his own harvest field. Constant exposure has rendered him indifferent to the approach of danger. Crafty and patient, he consults the instincts of primitive man, and rivals the Indian in detecting the haunts of an enemy. The laws of God

¹ In these boundless wastes the greatest and most noted trapping ground is on Green (Colorado) river, beyond Fort Laramie, as well as on the streams beyond Budger's and Vasque's fort.

he does not know, those of men he does not care to remember. It was perhaps the fancied abridgement of his liberties by the latter, that led him first to cast his life upon the domains of nature, and the exile will not brook that the system which has ostracized him should, even by the feeblest prestige of its remembrance, haunt him in his solitude. His unfettered wishes form the code by which his actions are governed.

In the fierce contests of the passions, none perhaps displays itself with more signal energy than that of revenge. It is, we believe, the peculiar honor of the Gospel among all religions, and the shining token of its superhuman origin, that with its sublime doctrine of forgiveness it has shorn of its strength this Agonistes of man's depraved nature. But the highly seasoned banquet to which the trapper is accustomed to treat his innate propensities, gives this characteristic the full means of maintaining in his case its terrible ascendancy. It glares fiercely through all his achievements. These achievements, it is true, are remarkable. They rank as high in their gross sense among heroic deeds, as the Rocky mountains upon which they are transacted among the mountains of the globe. But as the Wind River chain owes its brilliancy to the perpetual snows which in a temperate latitude crown its summit—to a cause which forbids the spread of all genial verdure, so none but a frigid mind, and frozen state of the kindly affections, could exhibit the wild prowess, and display the inhuman feats of revenge, that signalize the trapper's history. We will mention here two instances for all. We choose them, not that they are marked by special atrocity in mountain adventure, for this is by no means the case, but because in addition to their retaliatory aspect, they serve to exhibit, to some extent, the reckless daring of the trapper. Col. Fremont, in his Report of the Exploring Expedition which traversed California under his command, relates an adventure under this head on the part of two trappers; one of whom was Kit Carson, the Chevalier Bayard of mountain chivalry, the other, Godey, a St. Louis Frenchman. To avenge the massacre of two New Mexicans, and recover some stolen horses, these men rode at a hard gallop from sixty to a hundred miles, charged at daybreak into an Indian village filled with *braves*, (save the mark!), dispersed the savages like a herd of deer before them, and returned to camp with the lost animals and two propitiatory scalps.

An exploit of a similar character was performed, whilst a party, consisting of twelve or fifteen trappers, was sweeping a few years ago like a whirlwind through the mountains, under the

direction of 'Old Walker.' It had left the head waters of the Platte, for the purpose of making a swoop upon the mission of San Fernando, on the Las Animas, and carrying off the choice cattle and horses belonging to the sacred precincts. A body of the Apaches had stolen one night some horses of the band, and murdered the horse-guard. Next morning five of the trappers, mounted upon strong horses, followed the Indians upon their trail, through the mountains, to their village, there charged headlong among them, recovered their stolen property, and returned to their comrades at sundown, with thirteen scalps of these nomadic robbers dangling from their rifles.

The doom of Ishmael, 'whose hand was against every man and every man's hand against him,' is but the necessary condition of a barbarous state. At the heart of all life reigns selfishness. This principle, whose impetuous impulses are attempered by beneficent checks in a state of civilized society, becomes autocratic in a state of nature. Every man does that which seems good in his sight. The trapper's reckless disregard of Indian rights is transparent through all his actions. He is consequently an object of hatred to all the neighboring tribes, and to all he presents a dauntless front. Thus on the prairie, or in the mountains, it is with him a perpetual game of life and death. His mind is ever upon the bend. A turned leaf, a disconcerted blade of grass, the flight of a bird, or the significant look of his mule, may convey to his practised powers of observation a lesson of the deepest import to his welfare. He has learned to decipher, with the facility of a native, this language of moving symbols. The equal of the savage here, he is his superior beside in powers of wit and contrivance, which inure to him through his civilized origin. So that for every scalp of a trapper that enlivens an Indian war dance, the trapper 'lifts the hair' of at least ten red skins.

He sometimes, from motives of policy, forms an alliance with the tribe upon whose grounds he is trapping. He adopts as a matter of course for the time its politics, such as they are, and shares its national feuds. Were it not like sullying the impassioned moral grace of the beautiful language of Ruth to Naomi, we might use that language to express happily the trapper's agreement in this league with the tribe: "Whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

Let us pause here to consider how it is, that civilized man lapses with such facility into the barbarities of savage life. Selfishness, we have already remarked, is a great organic principle

of life, and always ascendant in a barbarous state. Encircled as we happily are by circumstances of another kind, nothing less than a strong effort of the imagination can enable us to trace the changes leading to intellectual and moral debasement, which are wrought upon the trapper by his removal from society. We must consider in general how, as the harvest man throws aside his coat, he has thrown aside the social affections; how he has separated himself from sympathy with all the healthful interests which animate the public world; how, in his state of isolation, he feels no longer within him even the remote pulsations of the great heart of humanity. Let any one analyze his own nature, and see whether its nobler qualities have not flourished chiefly under the sunshine of home, community, and church; let him see whether these interests have not all along given the strong check to the imperious native principle of selfishness, and whether he is not indebted to them for the development and moulding of his own best manhood. Let him do this, and he will be able to appreciate, to some extent, the condition of the trapper, whose life has been wholly sundered from these beneficent institutions of providence.

An element of barbarism may readily take growth in a negative condition of the mind,—in its failure to consider habitually and attentively the wants and feelings of others. Human nature needs, to sustain its better qualities, the mollifying power of active sympathy. The dark side of society,—that side which gloomily discloses the pains and sorrows of human life, which reveals female tears and infirmities side by side with the wants and dependence of childhood, is not to be regarded as a flaw in the world's social constitution. It has its great ameliorating intention. It exerts a remedial influence upon the barbarous tendencies of the strong man. It acts as did the wand of Moses upon the rock. It draws forth streams of tenderness, which by reciprocal action refresh again these weak afflicted ones. The sealed fountain is broken, and its healing waters leap forth through the flinty mould of the mind. The desert of the heart is made to blossom like the rose.

The *family* and the *church* are indispensable conditions of pure civilization. Even in the midst of society, as we have it around us, they are called into daily struggle with the selfish downward drift of man's nature. Consider a man as he appears in the strife of worldly business, subject to the hourly collisions of sordid interest,—consider the gross forms of selfishness which the contentions of external life strengthen and fortify within him, until with compressed lips and inflected brows he schools

himself to the purpose of proscribing all humane and tender emotions, and resolves to brave and browbeat the cold heartless world with its own malignant weapons. Note these tendencies of secular life, and then bless the domestic corrective given in God's kind providence to mankind. The morose worldling passes from the marts of trade, or from sweaty field labors to the door of his home. Now look how his stern visage begins to relax, as helpless childhood waddles toward his embrace; how his fierce selfish resolves melt away like April snow, when he finds that his wants and comforts have been cared for, and that loving confiding ones, clambering over his knees, and clasping his brawny neck, are expecting from him offices of kindness. The lesson of the day is forgotten in the lesson of the evening.

So again practical philanthropy is grounded upon the doctrines of grace. A sense of divine mercy and the remission of sins is necessary to produce the elements of genuine good will toward all mankind. Divine compassion, copious and free, dispensing pardon and kindling hope, impresses itself upon the susceptibility of the human heart, until that heart, like the sweet nightly moon, sheds in turn the reflected grace of the bright original. But the church must school its subject, to discriminate between consistent christian views of divine clemency and mere vapid freethinking conceptions of the same. The latter, like the apples of Sodom, serve in the end but to mock human hope. The church, when true to its office, portrays divine mercy in the midst of justice,—justice displayed with all its penal consequences,—to give it in men's minds its true value. The tenet of mercy rests upon the tenet of wrath, and it is this that gives it its essential prominence. It is like the rainbow, which glows promissorially when drawn upon the darkly rolling cloud, whose flashing thunders have filled us with awe, but which would have no significance if seen to arch the smiling red of a tranquil sunset. By enforcing these correlative truths, the church humbles the pride of man, abates his selfishness, and constrains him to adopt the pity of God as the habit of his moral life. "We pray for mercy, and that same prayer doth teach us all to render the deeds of mercy."

If these views be correct, if the whole force of the family and church be hardly sufficient to restrain the barbarous proclivities of man, when placed within the circle of their direct influence, then may heaven have mercy upon the recluse trapper! The syllepeis used by Christ to the daughters of Jerusalem, may with a liberal construction be applied to him: "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in a dry." The im-

pressions made upon the morning of his life, by the household and sanctuary, have gone like morning dews. Even the Sabbath, which followed him into the wilderness, he has wrested from God. He has become in consequence a barbarian.

Let us pass from these reflections now to the Rocky mountains, and view the trapper at home. In the silent interior of those mountains, upon an affluent of one of those mighty rivers, which, from the same lofty circle within sight of Fremont's Peak, flow diversely to the Pacific or to the Gulf of Mexico, he encamps for the season. His lodge is a frame of willows, covered with two or three deer-skins. A slender pole laid across from bough to bough between two neighboring trees, strung with choice pieces of buffalo, beaver-tail and venison, above the reach of wolf or coyote, constitutes his larder. He has chosen for his encampment a picturesque yet convenient locality. Upon the north, a lofty battlement of rocks impends to shelter the spot from the sweep of the wild mountain storms, whilst between the ridges stretching right and left the horizontal beams of the morning and evening sun may enter to brighten glen, cascade, and green acclivity, in front of him. For months he never looks upon a human face. Yet the solitary trapper, in his gross way, enjoys life. Like the salient yearling in shaded pastures, he exults in the thrilling sense of animal enjoyment. He sallies forth every morning, in his barbarous costume, to visit his traps, with a fresh elastic tread. His dress is characteristic: a hunting frock of buckskin ornamented with long fringes, pantaloons of the same fabric embellished with porcupine quills, and fringes reaching down outside the whole length of the leg. He wears deerskin moccasins on his feet, and a flexible hat of felt on his head. Nothing can be more charming than his mountain path, or more inspiring than the semi-tropical vegetation, that, in the midst of that treeless range of mountains, skirts the wild stream in front of him. There is the fragrant sombre cone of the pine and cedar, there the huge spreading arms of the oak, the summer-flowering dome of the chestnut, and the bowery screen of the wild grape, as stretching from tree to tree it ever woos with inconstant affection another and another love. The air bathes him with a delicious freshness, and the blue sky has the purity if not the balm of the Ionian heaven.¹ A troop of bounding

¹ All traders, trappers, and California gold diggers, with whom we have conversed in *propria persona* or in books, unite in praising the atmosphere of the Plains and Rocky mountains. They are in raptures with the dry pure elastic character of the air, and the delicious transparent blue of the

antelopes, or the stately tread of an elk, will now and then bring down the rifle from his shoulder. High on inaccessible crags, standing like statues of themselves, groups of the mountain sheep or bighorn look down upon him, like motionless sentinels of nature stationed upon her citadels in that wild realm.

Not unfrequently fortune brings together several of these mountain men, during their migrations from stream to stream in quest of beaver. Another view of the trapper's life presents itself then. For a day or two the cares of trapping are remitted, and the season is given to social amusement. The most common diversion to which these athletic huntsmen resort on such occasions, is firing at a mark. A blaze is hewed upon a tree, and a rude bull's eye sketched with wet powder forms a primitive target. The rough applause, which follows a centre-shot at a hundred paces, is worth to the marksman the price of his rifle. At night they encircle their blazing camp fire, and the social sentiment, so long sealed up, now glows like a transparency in every look, word, and gesture. The virtues of his rifle, the wisdom of his horse, or the thrift and shrewdness of the beaver, are topics of boundless enthusiasm with each speaker. Nor does the audience form an idle group upon these occasions. By the light and aid of the central fire, one, it may be, is employed cleaning his rifle, another melting down lead for bullets, and another repairing his torn moccasins. Amid this scene of industry thrilling adventures with the savages are related, and are heard almost with an air of indifference by men who have learned to look upon the most perilous occurrences as in keeping with the reasonable expectation of life. Around upon the level pla-

heavens. "The moon," remarks one who was ordinarily no poet, "shone upon us with an effulgence almost equal to that of a vertical sun, and the starry firmament, when there was no moon, glowed with a brilliancy and glory we had never before witnessed." A curious incident in the journal of W. H. Richardson, a private soldier under Col. Doniphan's command during his wild irruption into Mexico, mentioned as having occurred at the battle of Sacramento, gives strange confirmation to the statement. "It is a fact worthy of note," he says, "that the atmosphere here in this mountainous region is so perfectly pure and clear that a cannon shot can be seen coming, when it is a considerable distance off, by leaving a blue streak in the air. Many a soldier saved his life in the battle by dodging the balls as they came forward. When a flash would be seen from the enemy's battery, you could hear the soldiers cry out—'Watch the ball, boys!—here comes a ball, boys,' and they invariably avoided them, or the slaughter must have been very great. I saw a ball coming in the direction where I was, when immediately falling off my mule it passed just over my saddle without injury."

teau they occupy, their horses and mules are tethered. The light of the shining fire exhibits through the quiet night the submissive contented forms of these animals, as standing or reclining they enjoy a kind of half sleep, happily relieved from travel and scorching sun and prairie flies.

But the 'Rendezvous,' to which the trapper repairs during the latter part of the summer, embraces for him the great holiday interest of the year. It holds out for him during his sequestered ramblings a prospect equivalent to that, which a London winter offers to the opulent rural gentry in the remote districts of England. Here then we may see the highest style of the trapper's life. The wassail of Christmass and New-Years', the epicurism of Easter, and the turbulent patriotism of the Fourth-of-July, together with the grosser characteristics of all other good days, so well known to children and all true catholics, combined, compounded, and moulded into a festal pattern, would, if divested of their least obnoxious features, furnish something like a type to represent the orgies which here for weeks disgrace the place. A spot is chosen for this great annual fair somewhere in the wild interior of the Rocky mountains, generally within some timbered mountain valley upon the head-waters of the Colorado. The skin of the beaver during the dog-days is of little value, and accordingly the different fur companies, under whose auspices the rendezvous is held, meet then through their agents, the trappers and hunters, and receive from them the products of their skill and industry for the year. Several hundred of these mountain men will often assemble together at one of these haunts. Hordes belonging to the neighboring Indian tribes will also repair to the spot, and encamp in the vicinity. Hither too traders from Missouri and the Mexican settlements are accustomed to resort, well supplied with alcohol and such other goods as are adapted to the mountain market. The trappers enter the encampment on horseback, singly or in small bands, and drag after them their ill-looking mules now burdened with costly packs of beaver. Trapping has proved to many of them a lucrative pursuit. They frequently cast upon the ground, at their arrival, as the fruit of the year's labor, from one to two thousand dollars' worth of peltries. The fair now opens with a brisk trade in furs and buffalo skins on the part of the free trappers;—i. e., those trappers who have not hypothecated their services to any of the fur companies for their outfit, and who offer their peltries at the rendezvous to the highest bidder. At a time when the clink of silver is so distinctly heard, the *traders* are by no means idle spectators. Some of this class are young men from the eastern cities, in

truth fine hearty fellows, who enliven the virile sodality of the encampment with flashes of wit and peals of laughter. But others are the dark-visaged conscripts of Moloch, who in their transit through the fires of Tophet, have had every sentiment of humanity crisped and consumed within them. Upon the rude stands they have erected, alcohol diluted to the agreeable strength of old Monongehela whisky is conspicuously placed. The trappers, with their dry leathern throats stimulating them to the sacrifice, soon part at these tempting retail stations with their hard-earned wealth.

But this mountain retreat is not consecrated to the genius of traffic alone. Interests of a wholly different kind throw a charm over the place for this motley concourse of men. Removed, as they are at this spot, a thousand miles from civilized abodes, the menacing arm of the civil law is not seen in the distance, the monitory tones of the church bell are not heard. Vice smiles here in broad daylight, and without a blush beckons all to her entertainments. Every desire, with the trapper, becomes a propensity, every propensity a passion, and every passion a disease. An unconditional surrender to dissipation is the order of the season, and grog scenes of drunken folly fill up the circle of each day. Exercises in running, wrestling, boxing, leaping, and pitching the quoit,—the *quinquertium* of the ancient Olympic Games, are his least exceptionable forms of diversion. But even in these exercises which sometimes enliven the glades around the encampment, we look in vain to the trapper for a shadow of that intellectual grace which enabled the semi-civilized Greek to discern a full reward for the contest in a chaplet of olive,—to trace through the beautiful symbolization a meed more precious than diamonds, and worth the loftiest human endeavors:—that grace of intellect, indigenous in the pristine life of Greece, which under this civic crown dispensed tones of exalted virtue to whose echoes the world, with the reverence of childhood, still loves to listen. The mind of the American trapper is cast in a much rougher mould. But we must admit, that whilst those sublime traits of character which shine down upon us from distant ages, like the stars from heaven, have been withheld from him, he is nevertheless eminently endowed with those superb physical qualities which ever dazzle the mind of sense, and elicit the strongest sympathy from the plebeian crowd. Thus feats of agility and strength are no doubt performed in these retired Olympian, which, if known, would cause the admirers of Yankee Sullivan or of Tom Hyer to clap their hands with surpassing glee. This presumption may lead us to regret that no

American Pindar lives to enshrine in immortal odes the glory of these buckskin contests,—a glory which, in the present state of things, is doomed to elicit nothing better than the uproarious applause of a few traders and Indian hunters, reclining lazily under the adjacent cotton-wood.

The trapper has a morbid passion for gambling. In the shade by day, and around the fires by night, groups may be constantly seen, seated upon the ground after the Indian mode, with blankets spread before them, engaged at play. The currency of the mountains is beaver; and the stakes are always estimated by that standard. In a brief hour or so, a large mountain fortune often passes, upon the luck of cards, to a second or third ownership. The insatuated trapper, who is stripped of his wealth, not unfrequently proceeds in his phrensy to stake his horse, mule, rifle, hunting equipments, and, if he has one, even his Indian wife. The interest of the lookers on always deepens in proportion to the desperation of the game. The agony of the loser has an indefinable charm for natures, to which the sight of human distress has become an agreeable excitement. They apprise the encampment of all such shadowy passages in play, by shouting, in tones widely removed from those of gentle sympathy: "There goes hos and beaver."

No wonder that under the excitement of cards frequent brawls should ensue. In the settlement of disputes on such occasions by the laws of honor, these semi-barbarous scions of the Anglo-Saxon stock waive generally those factitious ceremonials which dignify the duels of their more polished kindred. The parties withdraw on the instant to a neighboring glade, and having marked off at a guess twenty paces, decide at once the justice of the quarrel with their rifles. The inevitable death of one, if not of both, follows, and peace is again transiently restored in the encampment.

At certain periods a softer grace is shed over the rough features of the scene. Young Indian girls, fantastically painted, and having their graceful persons bedecked with savage ornaments, emerge like nymphs from the surrounding defiles, and enter the rendezvous. A scene follows then which, if carefully studied, might impart some useful hints even to those in more polished society, who wish to become proficient in the ignoble art of coquetry. These mountain belles have looked forward to this conjuncture of time and place, for months, through the charming medium of hope. Here their fortune in life, they trusted, was to be made. The trapper appears to the Indian maiden, when compared to the braves of her own people, a being of a

superior order. To become his wife is the heaven of her ambition. All the charms of nature and savage art are accordingly brought into play, at this time, to secure the realization of her long-cherished dream. She dances in front of the camp-fire where the trapper sits, she smiles, dons pretty looks, and glides fleetly under the green cotton-wood trees, casting from time to time coy loving glances at the elected idol of her maidenly worship. Sometimes the impatient primitive maid, to test the effect of her graces, and to settle the question of conquest,—a question intensely interesting to every female heart,—adopts an expedient, which is however by no means confined to mountain courtship, and which satisfactorily shows that the philosophy of the heart in some of its branches is studied to as much advantage upon the woodless ranges of the Rocky mountains, as it is in fashionable city saloons. Let her but kindle the fire of jealousy, and her work is done. The blaze that follows will invariably reveal, when it exists, the delicate secret lodged in the depths of the masculine heart. She approaches, in her aboriginal minuet, some discarded lover of her tribe, who may be leaning like a statue of despair, against a tree within the circle of the encampment. The smile she gives him is like morning to his soul. The red marble is changed into life, and blithely seizes her offered hand for the fandango. Soon however is he made to repent of his presumption, by some cruel humiliation. The trapper, it may be, springs to his feet, strides across the emerald floor, and with a sledge-hammer blow brings his rival to the attitude, if not the feelings, of an oriental worshipper. He may deign, perhaps, the synchronal remark, "Quit you darned Injun, you can't shine in this crowd." The heart of the mountain maiden glows at the success of her stratagem. She "has caught her Anthony in her strong toil of grace."

Many of the trappers marry Indian women. And as they always rank with the highest of the native chiefs, public sentiment on the mountains confirms to them the prerogative of those chiefs of having a plurality of wives:—a prerogative, from the exercise of which they are seldom debarred by any religious scruples with regard to the subject of polygamy.

In the sketch we have drawn here of the trapper's life, those, who are to any degree conversant with the facts, will see, that, if it prove variant in any thing from the reality, this variance has resulted from the fault of softening too much the features of the picture. The grossness and corruption of that life, in its savage debasement, should perhaps have been presented in stronger relief, to satisfy the severe eye of truth. It makes us

smile then, in face of the music here, to think of Rousseau's doctrines of primordial purity, and the spontaneous grace of human development, in the normal school of nature. The sentimental radicalism of this scheme, ever shifting, with the facility of a French battalion, its form and position, is still protruding itself both in Europe and America, through and above the surface of the steady conservative progression of our own age. The abnegation of central constitutional evil in human nature ever lies at the root of the scheme, under the various flowerings of its manifold species. It will be alleged, we presume, that the trapper's life affords no fair ground for an argument here, because, for what we know, he may at the first have been a worthless renegade from society;—and that we might with like propriety reason upon the inadequacy of a popular government to the fulfilment of its ends, by adducing facts in our generalization altogether drawn from a community of Sydney convicts. In answer we remark, that many of the trappers are by no means distinguished for immorality when they first enter the American wilds. There are hundreds from New England and from Canada there, who before they left the settlements compared favorably in point of moral character with the great body of the population around them. The experiment has been fairly tried in their case. The mind, as instructed by honest ratiocination, must ascribe then the huge growth of depravity which has since deformed this good character to a sufficient cause,—to an interior hot-bed of evil, removed from the checks found in the family and church. For if evil was but incidental to man's nature, if its force and pressure were wholly received from his external relations, then would the sacred influences of nature at work upon the trapper in his complete isolation from his race, for months at a time,—the magnificent solitudes to whose grand tranquil preaching he daily listens, gradually abate the power of those sinful habits, he had contracted through intercourse with society in his earlier life. This must indeed be the tendency of the scheme, if the strength of those habits was not 'renewed like the eagle's' through the force and operation of an inward constitutional law. With the trapper before us, this project of natural innocence sounds like a lunatic's dream, fitted, according to one's mood, either to awaken mournful regrets, or to excite the scornful smile of incredulity.

But is there no intrinsic instructive and sanctifying power in the majesty of nature? May we not find under any conditions a reformatory institute in the illimitable plains of the West? To him who has walked by faith through the garden of Eden,

the great prairie becomes in truth *the garden of God*. It discloses not, like the paradise of an eastern prince, an artistic profusion of foliage, flower, and fruit, to the astonished sight: but a sublimity and joy grow slowly upon the mind, when contemplating its vast undulating stretches. We stand in the midst of the garden, and its surrounding wall is the strong blue horizon, reaching high to heaven. The green slopes and smiling flowers in the mighty plain, or its animate inhabitants, objects simply of the curious senses, are all merged in the glowing sights and swelling sounds which address themselves to the yearning soul. Or rather these, which make the cardinal objects of contemplation in a common landscape, find here like orchestral performers their just province, in preparing the soul for more exalted topics. We see in the still and glowing evening, far in the distance, endless parallels of waving green, looming with shifting hues in solemn measured succession across the horizon, whilst mystic swells from time to time fall upon the attentive ear, like reverberations from the spirit world. It is "the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day." We are alone, and *Jehovah* is approaching! There are no trees of the garden now,—no church, no ministry or sacraments, typical and mediatory—among which we may hide ourselves from the divine presence. We are brought into direct unity with God on the open prairie. Now does the soul begin to interpret that summons of startling import which comes over the plain, "Man where art thou?"

Again, the prairie to the student is *the poem of God*. The daring fancy and art of man have not yet checkered it with interpolations. It appears still in its grand primitive characters. It is a majestic epic; and those solitary sylvan islets, far to the South and to the West, are but charming interludes, intended to relieve the mind amid the solemn grandeur of the narrative. We almost feel, as we think of the cities that shall hereafter deck the vast plain, of the trim country houses with their rectilineal orchards, and checkered-boards of fenced grain fields, that the utilitarian who may first sink a spade here, to break the charm inherent in the visioned grandeur of the place, should suffer the penalty which he would endure whoever might add to or take from the written book of God.

The prairie, to the christian, becomes *the mirror of God*. His unchangeable character is reflected in its changeless surface. Here the great I AM has registered his image. Here the ages return upon themselves. The earth still presents that fascinating maidenly smile, which on the creation day drew forth the

divine approbation, and made the Sons of God to shout for joy. That smile, radiant upon the face of this Eden, still kindles and glows with vestal consecration for heaven alone. It brightens not to enchant the heart of man. Its great heavenward intent, like the mysterious expression of Raphael's madonnas, produces sympathetically a profound longing in the soul after the Divine Good—a longing which is the *natural* germ of spiritual greatness in man.

We stand here in the primeval realm of time. It is another morning of the world. We look down wistfully upon the problematical future ;—we look down upon eras of history, of civilization, of grace. We divine the influences of this virgin nature upon the future man ;—its relations to religion, industry, and art. Shall the law of its being, the genius of the realm, the spirit of all true grandeur,—shall Simplicity establish its pure triumphs in the future civilized life of the Plains? Shall Truth and Liberty, in chaster forms than are yet known to the world, dwell here? Or shall the ghosts of Tradition flock to the first constituent assemblies of that life? Shall Prescription unfold here its antique embroidered models, that the constitutional law of civil and religious life may be blindly framed thereby? Or yet, as some events would prefigure, shall schemes of spiritual and social folly,—the nauseous spittle of healthful conservative life—by a squatter like tenure of this imperial grant of heaven, mock here the thoughtful mind of humanity for generations to come with the illusive phantoms of hope?

But we are told perhaps that we stand upon the grave of an ancient civilization: that the trapper's hunting ground is the cemetery of a departed world. Here then "are the graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them." The civilized life accordingly we would trace in the future is but a resurrection from the dead. Alpheus sinking in desolate sands reappears again beyond the Sicilian Sea, in the beautiful fountain of Arethusa. Under this aspect, the prairie becomes a sublime mystery. It is the confident of God ;—the sharer of a profound providential secret. In its calm majestic expression, it baffles the inquisitive researches of the antiquarian, and the few casual hints it imparts of a refined antiquity serve to bewilder the philosophic mind, much as the hieroglyphics of an obelisk bewilder the reason of a ploughman. Just to think, how unlike this ancient American civilization to that of Egypt or Asia or Greece, in its relations to the great progressive life of humanity. The temples of Thebes, the Partheon and the palaces of the blue-robed Assyrian, have cast upon the night

world stream ineffaceable images, glowing with lessons of beauty and truth for the perusal of the latest generations. But here flourished an isolated civilization; which sustained about the same relation to the historical progression of the world, that the christian kingdom of Prester John did to the historical progression of the church; that is to say no relation at all. Oh for one to approach us from the immeasurable ruins who could say, "I only am escaped alone to tell thee."

Not unfrequently some quiet farmer upon Election day, incited by company and drink, undertakes in loud and confident tones to settle questions of high national import, which for years may have perplexed great statesmen. He feels like a political prophet, for the time, among his neighbors. But after the lapse of a day, and the natural subsidence of his excitement he shuns, with a sentiment of shame, the faces which surrounded him at the Polls, and attempts, by diligently resuming the sober work of the cornfield, to dispel the confusion and tawny blushes painfully started by reflection. Having glanced, in a cooler frame of mind, at the excursion just made in respect to the suggestive tendencies of the prairie, we hasten back, with a feeling not altogether dissimilar to the farmer's, to resume the more legitimate details of our subject.

The Anglo-American trapper is less swayed by feelings of SUPERSTITION than his Canadian comrade, much less than his aboriginal neighbor. Superstition, always conceived under the auspices of spiritual ignorance, is the legitimate offspring of fear and guilt. Its power however is greatly dependent upon constitutional and national peculiarities of character. The Indian mind is a pensioner upon the government of the imagination. To this faculty is the American Savage indebted for the doctrines of his religion, the objects of his faith, and the heaven of his hopes. This is the elect organ, by means of which the superstition of his nature organizes its system of prodigies. Through this organ it seizes the elements of sublimity and terror inspired by the sombre forms of nature, and combining them with vague remembrances of ancient traditions, and gloomy innate ideas, frames a creed around which the dark moral sentiments of the captive mind stand as a perpetual life guard. But the trapper on his part appears with stronger practical powers of mind, attended with blunted moral instincts. He is at a loss to comprehend at first the despotic empire of omens and prognostics among the warrior tribes. Time and intercourse however—the great agents of assimilation—produce their habitual results upon his simple mind, until forgetting his earlier intellectual convictions,

he unconsciously glides within the magic realm of the Indian superstition. He now resembles those ancient colonists, who, after the expatriation of the ten tribes of Israel, were brought by the king of Assyria to repeople Samaria;—who “feared the Lord and served their own Gods.” Perhaps the only feature in which Cooper’s delineation of the *trapper* in ‘*The Prairie*’ expresses the full truth of life, is that of his mongrel faith. In almost every other view the picture is transcendental. It presents the trapper in a state of transfiguration. As well might we take Tasso’s radiant Rinaldo for a sober type of the French and Norman knighthood that actually fought with Godfrey at the storming of Jerusalem, as take the sentimental Natty Bumppo for a true key to the trapper’s character. But in the grave religious perplexity of the venerable hunter, in his devout respect for the Indian faith, wherein his dearest human friends had lived and died, and, chiefly, in the shadowy belief hesitatingly expressed in reference to the amazing paradox of a plurality of heavens, we are presented with a striking paradigm of the trapper’s hybrid theology. When he walks in front of the “medicine lodge,” the trapper renders mental homage to the mystery of the spot; he acknowledges the potency of those mnemonic incantations, by means of which the exercise of some dreaded divine prerogative is invoked. With a measured faith, he contemplates the immolation of hunting steeds upon the grave of the Chief, and traces through the intent of this modern hecatomb a practical providence, which admirably quadrates with the sensual complexion of his religious aptitude. He lends a credulous ear to the rehearsal of the Pueblo brave, who in the gloomy mountains of New Mexico has looked upon the solitary cave, in which a patient priesthood has for centuries kept vigils beside the undying fire: and where it is waiting to this day for the second advent of Quetzalcoatl—the god of the air,—who, according to traditional prophecy, shall come from the rising sun over the Gulf of Mexico, in his barge of rattlesnake skins, to establish another golden age. He frequents the thermal and mineral springs of the mountains, and propitiates with whimsical rites the fanciful divinities that dwell in the waters. In Ruxton’s “*Life in the far West*,” a glaring instance of superstition of the last kind is told, which we feel disposed to copy here. “He (Old Rube) had sought the springs for the purpose of invoking the fountain spirits, which, a perfect Indian in his simple heart, he implicitly believed to inhabit their mysterious waters. When the others had, as he thought, fallen asleep, La Bonté observed the ill-starved trapper take from his pouch a curiously carved red stone pipe,

which he carefully charged with tobacco and kinnik-kinnik. Then approaching the spring, he walked three times round it, and gravely sat himself down. Striking fire with his flint and steel, he lit his pipe, and bending the stem three several times toward the water, he inhaled a vast quantity of smoke, and bending back his neck and looking up, puffed it into the air. He then blew another puff towards the four points of the compass, and emptying the pipe into his hand, cast the consecrated contents into the spring, saying a few Indian 'medicine' words of cabalistic import. Having performed the ceremony to his satisfaction, he returned to the fire, conscious of having done a most important duty."

We have no wish, in these observations, to conceal from view the trapper's deserts. In addition to the direct contribution his pursuits have given toward the refinement of the age, we are free to confess that these pursuits have served incidentally to confer signal benefits upon the country. The trapper is the precursor and herald of a mightier power behind. Every shot from his rifle sounds the way, amid unknown magnificent realms, for the industrial march of civilization, as it comes with the axe and plough in the distance. Let his valuable public services, so far as they go, be set off against his crimes. The nation is deeply in debt to the trapper; as any one who will take pains to investigate the history of the different expeditions sent out by the government, from time to time, for the exploration of the great West, must soon discover. This merited concession however does not affect the general view we have given of the trapper's character. The degeneracy of this character proceeds necessarily from his mode of life, which is as incompatible with health of morals, as the exhalation from a western marsh with health of body.

At the close of every season, many of these hardy men fail to return from their hunting expeditions. They have met death amidst the awful solitudes of nature, by the hand of the Indian, or by disease. The absence of one or another from the annual Rendezvous may excite, upon that occasion, among the roistering survivors, some careless inquiry respecting his fate, to which the equally careless reply,—“he's rubbed out may be,” or “he's gone under,” is perhaps given by some old comrade.¹

¹ The following graphic periods setting off some characteristics and recording the untimely fate of Williams and Smith two worthies of mountain celebrity, we copy from a private letter just received from a highly respected merchant of Independence, Missouri:

When, in time, Industry shall have filled with agricultural wealth the valleys of the Rocky mountains, when Art shall have crowned with ornate villages those sweet shadowy haunts, where wanton trapper bands still chant savage love-songs by moonlight with Indian maids amidst the turbulent fandango, and when Religion and Civilization shall have established generally their abode throughout the plains of the West, in vain shall the antiquary look for memorials of the deeds or misdeeds of these barbarous pioneers. Their actions make no durable impression upon the earth. And perchance some mountain creek or solitary ridge, where a trapper has fallen by the treachery of the natives, will transmit to posterity through its name christened after the tragedy, all that is left to perpetuate the memory of this unique class of men.

Sewickley, Pa.

D. E. N.

"Our town was once the rendezvous for the mountain men, and when we first moved here, a motley crowd I assure you were at times assembled in the place. Smaller towns a few miles west of us and more on the frontier have now become their favorite resorts. Nearly all who were once actively engaged in the trade have abandoned the trapper's life and embarked in other pursuits. Those who are left are not as their progenitors were. Old Bill Williams and Pegg'd leg Smith (alias one wooden leg) were known far and near. Williams was inoffensive, an easy good natured man, whose great delight was to deal in the marvellous and entrance the gaping multitudes with narratives of events, that did and did not take place. Smith was the boisterous, troublesome companion, especially when two or three sheets in the wind. It was customary with him to mount his horse, gallop around the square, chase all the boys in his way, and ride into the dram shop, drink off a glass of liquor and then toss the glass at the bar keeper's head. His last achievement in our town was to shoot off the lock from the tavern stable, release his horse held in custody for his bills, and then ride triumphantly off through the streets away to the plains. Poor fellows! they are now gone to their last resting place. Like the moth, they led a dazzling life which carried them away to certain destruction. Williams, who was known familiarly to nearly all the Indian tribes, and loved by all, was at last killed by his once best friends, the Eutaw Indians, near to Santa Fe in 1849. Smith perished a year or so before in the mountains, near the head waters of the Big Platte river. Many of like occupation figured somewhat, but not so conspicuously as did these two men. Such were all the Sublette family (four brothers), the Bents (three brothers), and Fitzpatrick, now Indian agent for all the wild tribes. This last, Fitzpatrick, has now become an important personage, and one well esteemed by our government."

REVERENCE AND RELIGION.

THE fear of the Lord is two fold. It may exist as a mere dread of his power and vindictive justice. As such it possesses no value, and only serves to degrade the subject of it to the level of the animal, that can also shrink at the approach of danger. But when it is coupled with intelligence and purity of feeling, it assumes an entirely different character. It then becomes *reverence*, which is said by Solomon to be "the beginning of wisdom," or religion in the soul. It shall be the object of this paper to show its fundamental character in the development of the christian life.

Reverence is one of those noble and exalted feelings, that distinguishes man from the brute creation, and is co-ordinate with reason and the gift of speech. As irrational creatures cannot reason or speak, so they do not possess reverence. God, who is above all, and over all blessed forevermore, is the proper and legitimate object for which this feeling is to be exercised. If he did not exist, or if he were not what he is, there could be no feeling of this kind at all. The world should be without form and void, a dreary waste, with nothing for intelligent beings to admire and adore. The light of the universe should have gone out in midnight darkness, and men and angels, supposing they could exist apart from God, should have been given over to eternal horror, to blackness of darkness forevermore. But the glory of the universe is the Supreme Being, whose presence spreads joy and happiness throughout his dominions, and calls forth the admiration of all, who can contemplate his adorable perfections.

The fear of the Lord implies in the first place reverence for the name, or character of God, wherever it is made known. The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night sheweth knowledge. In the works of creation, from the twinkling star far away in distant space, to the tender blade of grass beneath our feet, the power, wisdom, and goodness of God are plainly set forth. Evidently these things must have come from his creative hand, and when devoutly and piously contemplated, they lead the mind up to the Creator, the great Architect of all, and fill it with admiration and reverence. In the various events of history, that transpire among men, the same wisdom, power, and goodness may be seen as in the natural world, whilst at the same time other attributes of his char-

acter come more fully into view. Justice and Mercy are clearly seen in his dealings with nations and individuals, for whilst the wicked and the proud are overthrown as in a moment, at other times, they are spared and preserved. At one time, the blasphemer is suddenly cut off in his sins, at another time he is permitted to stand at least for a season. All this enables the serious mind to venerate the Being, who can thus rule over all, and temper his justice with mercy. There is a way of looking at nature and history, that excites no love for God, or regard for his name. Men for instance admire the world, the order and beauty of its parts, without referring them to God as their author, or the mirror of his presence. This is a mere sensual gratification and it can beget no reverence. Carlyle, who with a masterly hand has laid bare the weakness of the French infidels and makes it to consist in their want of reverence, expresses himself in his peculiar style in reference to Diderot, in the following language: "The unhappy man sailed through the universe of Worlds, and found no maker thereof; had descended to the abysses where Being no longer casts its shadow, and felt only the rain-drops trickle down; and seen only the rainbow of Creation, which originated from no sun; and heard only the everlasting storm, which no one governs; and looked upwards for the Divine Eye, and beheld only the black, bottomless, glaring Death's Eye-Socket; such with all his voyagings was the philosophic fortune he had realized."

It is, however, only in the revelation which God has made in the person of his Son, our Saviour, that his character comes fully to light. What is only dimly suggested in nature, is here revealed in the broad light of day. Here God is seen, as the Author and Creator of all things, the Judge and Ruler of the universe, and the merciful Father of all his children. His power and wisdom appear in their full extent; his justice infinitely strict and flexible, whilst his mercy is exhibited on a much larger scale than elsewhere. Here it is something more than mere patience with the sinner's folly, or long-suffering with the evil-doer. It extends to him abundant pardon, and with it, eternal life; something that nature could never have taught him. With such an exhibition of God, the intelligent mind, must fall down in admiration and praise, so soon as it catches a glimpse of his presence. That Being who possesses such a character, must become sacred in our eyes; his ways, his laws, his words, we must venerate, and violence done in any way to his name, inflicts upon us pain and sorrow. The saints of old present us with some remarkable exemplifications of such a feeling, when

God was pleased to reveal himself to them in some extraordinary manner. The patriarch Jacob in his dream saw heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending. When he awaked out of his sleep, he exclaimed, Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not. It is said that he was afraid,—that is, filled with reverence and awe, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven. The prophet Isaiah in holy vision saw the Lord sitting upon a throne and lifted up, and his train filled the temple, and above it stood the Seraphim, and one cried to another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. Then the prophet in the profoundest reverence says, Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. The Psalmist asks, who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in his holy place, as if a sacred awe checked his approach into the presence of God. John in the Revelation, says that he fell at the feet of Christ as a dead man. His reverence for his Lord and master, completely overcame his physical and mortal constitutions.

In the next place the fear of the Lord implies reverence for his Church, which becomes something sacred from its connection with Christ, who is in it, rules over it, and directs it from age to age down to the latest period of time. As a mere collection of good and pious men, the Church can claim the respect and consideration of all. But it possesses a divine, as well as a human side. It is the Kingdom of heaven, which has been set up in the world, and calls for and demands the allegiance of all men. Christ and his Church are one, as the Father and the Son are one. In the day of judgement he will speak to the wicked in this wise: *I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in.* Then the wicked who never believed that Christ was in his church and never saw him there, will say, when saw we Thee an hungered, or a thirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, and in prison, and did not minister unto thee. Christ will reply to them by saying, verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these, ye did it not unto me. In another place, he says, he that receiveth you, receiveth me. In these passages, and others like them, Christ evidently identifies himself with his people, and rightly too, for he and they are one. Reverence paid to the church, is reverence paid to Christ, and not to man. We call no man master, but as Christ is in his church, we look up to her with

filial reverence and regard ; we place ourselves under her instruction and care ; we look to her for comfort in distress, and instruction to guide our wandering feet aright, and submit ourselves to her wholesome discipline or reproof when we err, and regard it as coming from Christ himself.

A proper regard for the church necessarily begets reverence for everything connected with her. We reverence the ground upon which the outward building stands, and when we enter the sanctuary, we feel the presence of Him, who has there recorded his name. It is a beautiful custom handed down from former times, but now disappearing, for persons when they enter the church to pause in their pews, and with uncovered heads to offer up a silent prayer to God. This shows a proper feeling, and contrasts strongly with the irreverence, and irreligious spirit and air, that are so often witnessed in the sanctuary in our days. Ministers, the servants of the sanctuary, and stewards of the mystery of grace, have always been held in high esteem for their work's sake, except where a skeptical and profane spirit has lifted up its head in the community, and regard for religion itself has disappeared. It is, however, more especially in reference to the means of grace, that our reverence for the Church and Christ, is manifested. The Bible becomes to us the *Holy Bible*, and appears to us as a treasure above all price. It is our daily companion, a lamp to our feet, and a light to our ways. In the hour of affliction, its pages become resplendent with heavenly light, and in prosperity it is the ornament of all our joys. When we open its pages, a sacred awe checks our minds, and we fear to criticise, or doubt its contents. No man can read the scripture to any purpose, who has not learned to regard them with a kind of sacred awe. The sacraments have always excited reverential feelings in the hearts of devout worshippers. Men cannot divest themselves entirely of such feelings when they are administered in their presence, however much they are made to recede in the services of the sanctuary. They may deny that Christ is present on such occasions, and in their opposition to mystery, reduce them to empty ceremonies, still their own feelings, if they be not entirely dead to divine things, are the strongest proof that Christ is there in his power and his glory. The services of the sanctuary impart a sacredness to the day itself on which they are held, and hence we keep the sabbath day holy. Sabbath profanation is a sin, not because a day is disregarded ; but because it is a practical disregard for that for which the sabbath is kept. Sabbath breakers, therefore, in this country, where the sabbath is so intimately bound up with our religious services,

must be placed among those, who have not the fear of God in their hearts and no regard for the work of salvation, which it commemorates. There are other holy days that have been observed with reverential from an early period in the history of the church. They commemorate the leading facts in the Saviour's life, as they are presented to us in the creed. Love for Christ and faith in his work as consisting of different parts, such as his incarnation, his death, his resurrection and his exaltation to the right hand of the majesty in heaven, naturally lead to the observance of such days. Though neglected in this country, we may predict their return, so soon as the faith of the church is again reduced to the order in which it stands in the Apostles' Creed.

Next to the church as a divine institution in the world, parents, rulers, and all placed in authority, are objects that should be revered. All valid human authority comes from the Lord, and is on this account binding upon men. In a certain sense it is the authority of God, or at least an adumbration of that authority. The former prepares the mind as a preparatory discipline for the adoption of the latter. At first all the fear which the child can exercise towards God, is that which it exercises towards its parents; it has as yet no idea of God and his law, and can show reverence to none but its parents. This, however, is accepted of God, as shown towards himself. As years, however, pass away, and the mind expands, reverence towards God, the Father of all is developed. It has been prepared already to fear God; the habit of its mind has been to submit and obey, and it is now ready to pass from the service of its parents to the service of God. Hence that well established fact, that early religious instruction, at home by the fire-side, is so generally employed by Providence in raising up distinguished lights of the church, and of the age. Without such a previous training it is hard indeed for individuals to submit themselves to the authority of God in after years. They have not learned the lesson of fear in youth, and the older they become, the harder the task. The discipline of the state is similar to that of the parental, and deserve similar respect or regard. The man that professes superior piety, and regard for God, or "a higher law," and yet despises the laws of the land, miserably deceives and contradicts himself. His disregard for human tribunals measures his disregard for that which is divine. His higher law emanates from no deity, that lives and manifests himself in the history of the world, but from that airy substance, styled self, that has usurped the throne of his will.

We now contend that reverence as thus described, is the beginning of all wisdom, the starting point of all piety, or religion in the soul. When this is said, we are not to understand, that religion has its origin in the feeling of reverence. If this were so, it would be merely a human production, a plant that grows spontaneously from the soil of the human heart. But this were an impossibility. Men never become religious when left to their own spontaneous development. On the contrary their course is constantly downwards. Religion is something *back* of all that men can say, or do, or think, or feel. It comes to us as a pure gift from Jesus Christ, as a fountain of life and immortality to a world dead in trespasses and sins. Apart from Christ there is no hope for the world, as it is invincibly bound to the law of sin and death. But when this is said, it may nevertheless be affirmed, that reverence is something fundamental to all other religious affections, and underlies the whole frame-work of the christian life; it is a foundation-stone of all true christian activity, a prop or support, without which the whole structure must collapse and fall to the ground. In the history of redemption, in its progress from the lowest to the highest development, the fear of the Lord was first awakened, and was made to precede the love of God, and then to serve as the permanent basis of this latter. It was mainly the object of the Jewish dispensation to infuse into the constitution of the world, this divine, or heavenly fear. All the revelations, therefore, that were made to the Jewish church, were calculated to excite reverence rather than love. Its miracles, for instance those performed in Egypt, differed essentially from those of the Saviour. The former were destructive and terrific in their character, whilst the latter, were so many expressions of the divine benignity and love, designed to heal the bodies or the souls of men. The nearest approach in the christian to the Jewish miracle, is found in the fig-tree, that was made to wither on account of its barrenness. The old dispensation passed away, but was not destroyed. That reverence which it had served to engender remained, and formed the ground-work upon which the dispensation of love was to be reared. Fear became mature, and turned to love, and these became so united as to form only different sides of the same thing. The development of the individual christian life, is similar to that of the church as a whole. First the law, then the gospel; first fear, then love. This can be made to appear.

The godhead comes to man with the gift of salvation and eternal life. The Father draws the sinner to the Son through the Holy Ghost. The gift of all gifts is placed before him, and

he is invited to accept of it without money and without price. To become his he must receive and accept of it by faith. Now the first activity which the soul puts forth in receiving Christ, is reverence, or the fear of the Lord. This becomes active before love, or faith, or hope, and prepares the way for their existence. Before men can believe in God, hope in him, or love him, they must learn to fear him. He must gain the homage of their hearts, and the adoration of their tongues. Slavish fear drives the soul farther and farther away from God; a filial fear, however, draws it towards him. It comes trembling and afraid, into the presence of God, and yet drawn by a power, which it cannot resist, it comes and bows before him. So it is with the little child. Conscious of its faults, it comes tremblingly towards its parents, and yet because its parents, are to it the most lovely of all persons, it runs to their embrace. Religion consists much more in the fact that we are in constant communication with the life of the Redeemer, than in any efforts, or exertions, which we can make ourselves. To stand within the channel of such a communication of divine life, is to be in a state of grace. Reverence enables the soul to occupy such a relation with reference to Christ. It may be considered as the tendril of the soul, that reaches out to God for support, as the tendril of the vine, seeks the branch of some neighboring tree. It thus makes faith possible, which can be exercised only as the soul comes in contact with spiritual realities, and is itself the firm grasp which the soul is enabled to take of Christ. There are divinely appointed means, through which God imparts his blessings to men. Reverence brings the soul in contact with these; it leads the soul to the church, to the sacraments, to the house of prayer, to the word of God. Men never come to Christ, who despise the sanctuary, or regard the word of God lightly. How much does respect for the good and the pious in a community accomplish! The secret of the influence, which they exert, consists altogether in the reverence which they inspire by their life and example. We may lay it down as a rule, that as long as an individual can appreciate the value of good men, that this condition is a hopeful one, whereas there seems to be little hope for individuals or families, where the christian life ceases to be admired, or where some good man, or sound author is not revered as a sort of patron saint.

Further, reverence is something fundamental in the christian life, because it is a necessary support or basis to every christian grace. We have said that it preceded other gracious feelings and activities; we now say that it controls, and modifies them throughout.

Knowledge, christian knowledge leans upon reverence for support. Without such a ballast, it inflates its possessor, runs wild, and carries the soul into endless confusion and solitary wastes. The history of the church teaches us this melancholy lesson on every page of its past history. Men have approached the scripture with irreverent hands and sought to support by its authority, their own doctrines and speculations. They have tried to correct its teachings, turned its awful verities into mere fables, and professed themselves wise above that which is written. This has resulted altogether from the profane temper of their own minds, or from the spirit of their age, that could not separate the sacred from what is profane, and hence endeavored to mingle in horrid confusion heaven and hell, good and evil, life and death. If, however, the mind be reverential, it approaches the scripture with the conviction, that it contains, the mystery of mysteries. Ah! he touches the scripture with sacrilegious hands, who has not already learned to sit at the Saviour's feet, and meekly to receive his heavenly instructions. Religion is not inimical to the highest flights of the intellect; it lays no embargo on its adventurous voyages; it rejoices in the riches with which it comes freighted into the harbor. Man must speculate, if he is to remain man, and religion has given him the best impulse in that direction; it seeks to direct his flights; it points out the quick-sands, and whirl-pools, that endanger its course. In our days when the human mind has been so signally emancipated, when it disdains any longer to be confined to creeks and bays, and boldly pushes its way out into the ocean in quest of new discoveries; when it sets at defiance old and venerated theories, and in the glare of its own light forgets, that men have lived, and thought and reflected in other days, there is certainly reason for fear, lest in the love of adventure, a proper regard for the everlasting land-marks of Truth itself may be sacrificed. Upon the domain of religion, are observed full as many adventurers, and fortune-seekers as elsewhere, who have never learned to bow at the shrine of Truth, and hence strive to make it subservient to temporal ends and purposes. What is necessary to save the world of religious thought, is a return to the spirit of reverence, which will prompt men to adore and praise the majesty of the divine revelations, when and whenever made, and in our efforts to outrun degrading superstition, we must take heed lest we aim to be gods ourselves, knowing good and evil.

As reverence is a support to our intellectual development, so it is in regard to the purely moral part of our constitutions.

Without it, love or charity cannot be complete, nor indeed exist at all. Without the fear of God, the love of God, turns to improper familiarity with Him, and divine things, and men address Him very much as their equal, or companion. Such we find to be the case with all those kinds of piety, that are lacking in that element, which leads men to experience awe. Reverence must enter as an essential ingredient into all true piety, that men may be brought to occupy their proper position before the majesty of Heaven. It makes them feel their inferiority in the sight of God and gives place to humility, and all true and acceptable worship. It looks upon God, as the rightful Lord and master, and leads to holy obedience. Love and fear co-mingling in the soul, enable it to look upon the law of God, as something too sacred to be violated, and at the same time, a way of pleasantness, and a path of peace. It pierces the tenderest feeling of the pious heart, when men around set the divine authority at defiance; how much more must it start back with fear when it is made itself the occasion of marring and defacing all that is most lovely in the universe?

All moral progress presupposes some adaptedness of the soul, some remaining stamina of strength, as a commencing-point from which the building is to be carried forward. Such we have shown the fear of God to be. Without it man is a reprobate and not susceptible of receiving any healthful influence from above or beneath. We do not expect to raise a crop of grain from the mountain-rock, or the arid sand of the desert. So we do not look for the restoration of the lost spirits, in whom no longer a divine susceptibility is to be found. With man, however, who is yet in a transition-state, and who has not sunk so low, there is still hope, and that is to be found in his capacity of reverencing that which is above him and infinitely worthy of his regard.

From what has now been said, we are enabled to see the importance of the feeling of reverence, and at the same time the evil of a want of it. Irreverence is truly a fatal or mortal sin. Generally it is not thought so. For the most part it is regarded as a sin of small account, as compared with other sins. It seems to injure no person; it takes no person's property; it defames no person's character, and no immediate evil seems to result from it. Thus profane swearing in this country is regarded as the most venial of all transgressions, a mere peccadillo, that ought to be overlooked. But if what has been said is true, this view of things is an entirely false one. Irreverence and profanity of every kind strike at the very vitals of our moral

constitutions, and render the difficulty of our ever arising to a religious life so much the greater. In the body there are certain parts, that are more tender and sensitive than others ; when these are wounded, the danger is always the more imminent. In our moral constitutions, reverence is such a vital part. When that is entirely defaced, the last rays of spiritual light have become extinct. According to scripture, the culmination of all sin, is found in the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which it is said cannot be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come. Now nothing is more evident, than that this consists essentially in *gross irreverence*. The language as well as the connection implies this. The commission of this sin, requires the banishment of all regard for God and his authority from the heart, and strips him forever from becoming the subject of renewing grace. If the destiny of such a one be regarded as a hard one, no imputation can be made against the Creator, for his condition is one into which he has brought himself, by breaking through every restraint, and by inflicting upon himself the wound, which no grace can heal.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. A.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN NAME.

A practical exposition of Acts. ii : 26, "and the disciples were called christians first at Antioch."

THE name of a thing is according to its original intention the expression of its essence, the making known of the thing itself. By means of sin, that great lie, it is true a contradiction has been introduced into the world, between the Inward and Outward, between Spirit and Flesh, also between Essence and Name. But this disharmony finds no place in the significance of things, as they proceeded from God ; much rather, the names of Holy writ, the Book of revealed Wisdom, are in the highest degree significant. This holds also with reference to the name of the Confessors of our Saviour, with which idea we have here to do. At first, things were known by various appellations, all of which had reference to a particular phase of their character, and the problems which they were to solve. They called themselves "*Disciples*," of Jesus Christ—their divine Teacher, whom they were to follow and to obey—or "*Holy*" because separated from the World and from sin, consecrated to the service of the Triune God, and called to unceasing efforts towards moral perfection—or "*Brethren*," because they constituted One Family of the Redeemed, One Soul, One Heart, One Body and were to become more and more One by means of Love, as they were One by Faith in the Lord.

The name "*Christian*" arose according to the text, first at Antioch, the capital of Syria, and the mother congregation of heathen missions, about the year 40 according to our time. It is not said, however, from whence it came. Certainly not from the Jews, because they called the hated followers of the crucified Jesus, whom they would not accept as Christ, that is, the promised and by themselves expected messiah, "*Nazareans*" or "*Galileans*." It is most probable that it came from the Gentiles, who saw in Christ not a title of office, but a proper name, with which they desired to denominate the believers, in the same way as we speak of *Caesareans*, *Lutherans*, *Zwinglians*, *Swedenborgians*, *Kantians*, &c. Notwithstanding this, the appellation was not accidental, but was by the guidance of divine Providence, without whose will not a hair can fall from our heads and at the same time no thought proceeds from the heart and not a word from the mouth of man. The heathens at Antioch, became in this case, without knowing or desiring it, prophets, similar to Balaam, and Caiaphas, with his remarkable

words:—"It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." They gave expression to a deep truth of which they themselves had no presentiment or knowledge. For the name christian is peculiarly expressive, and in the highest degree suitable, significant of that which every confessor of Christ should be in distinction from Heathen, Jew or Turk. For such reasons it soon became general among the faithful, and to this day is the appellation by which those baptized into Christ, and who receive salvation from him, are called.

It is therefore of great importance, for each one, to discover the *significance of the christian name*, which we all bear, no matter of what persuasion, and to learn the glorious privileges and sacred duties which it comprehends.

In general the name christian denotes a confessor, adherent and follower of Jesus Christ, such an one, in whom the life of our Lord is continued, and who is so to speak a second Christ, and always is to become more and more so, of course in a relative sense, and with constant dependence upon Him, the Prince of our Salvation, the Author and Finisher of our faith. We can reach the significance of the christian name in the best way if we proceed from the significance of the *Person and Work* of Jesus Christ. From this then as a consequence we shall have our *character* and our *mission*, or what we, as his confessors or his followers are, and what is before us, to be *accomplished* and *effected*.

§1. If we inquire first into the proper nature of the *Person* of Jesus Christ, we find it to consist in the inmost, pure and indissoluble *union of the divine and human natures*, in virtue of which he is the mediator and reconciler between God and man, the Author of our Redemption and our communion with the Godhead. In the Gospels he declares himself, with peculiar preference the "*Son of Man*," to show his condescension to us, his real communion and inward participation in every thing really human, yea, in our sufferings, in our weakness and wants. He possessed Body, Soul and Spirit as we do; was a babe at his mother's breast, an obedient child, youth and man, advanced in age, and grew in wisdom and favor with God and man. He hungered and thirsted, ate and drank, was awake and slept—was tried and tempted, as we are, but without, for a moment, giving way to temptation—suffered, died and was buried, in short, in every thing he was made like unto us, sin excepted, which guilt, as an innocent surety, as a voluntary representative he removed on the accursed tree. In spite of this condescen-

sion and form of a servant, we see in him, manifested the highest bloom and fruit of humanity—we see in him our race redeemed, ennobled, glorified, perfected. He is called "*Son of Man*" also in this sense, because he is the ideal, the complete *man*, the second divine Adam, the representative of the new creation—the whole regenerated humanity. On the other hand, he is as often called the "*Son of God*," particularly by the Apostles, and that in the most complete sense, as the only begotten of the Father, who was with the Father from the beginning, whose glory, full of grace and truth is reflected through the veil of his human nature. He is the Word, being from Eternity with God, yea according to his nature, was God himself; in whom dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily; in fine he is God himself, revealed in the flesh for our temporal as well as eternal salvation. Here "where the divine and the human are united in one, where perfect fullness appears," is the great central mystery, the fundamental truth of christianity—here the depth, into which angels desire to look—here the inexhaustible source of reconciliation—of life—of salvation to the creature needing, as well as desiring Redemption.

What has now been affected in a perfect and complete sense in Jesus Christ, shall, as far as possible in a finite creature, be repeated in every christian. We are all in a relative sense children of God, unless we bear the holy name of our Saviour in vain, and we are to become more and more so. The Saviour took our human nature, to make us, as Peter says, "partakers of the divine nature." We are all sons of men, and shall always remain so. Christianity aims not at the destruction of our natural dispositions, but to redeem them from the power of sin, to sanctify and to place them upon that grade of perfection, so that the complete christian is at the same time a perfect man and vice versa. In order that this may have place, the impartation of a new life is necessary—and upon the basis of our natural birth, a regeneration proceeding from above, must be effected,—the old, wild trunk, which at best can produce but evil fruit, must be grafted by the divine husbandman with a pure graft, which gradually grows with the former, until it brings forth pure shoots, blossoms and fruit. That is, in order to have part in Christ and his means of salvation, we must become *Sons of God*, or, rather, as the Scriptures, to preserve the high dignity, the eternal and perfect Sonship of Christ, generally call the faithful, "*children of God*," yet without thereby ceasing to be children of men. He that has merely natural Sonship and is born from the will of the flesh, deserves not the title of christian;

only those who receive Christ, who really and truly believe in his name, and are born of God by the creative power of the Holy Ghost. This second birth is nothing more than the implanting of the divine, eternal life in us, as natural generation is the transferring of the natural life of the parents—the continuation of the same life in a new being. The begotten always partakes of the nature of him begetting—what is born of the flesh, is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. We are to be made then through the agency of the Holy Ghost, in a particular sense, “partakers of the divine nature,” by which our sinful nature is cleansed, transformed and glorified, in a leaven-like manner,—the divine life of Christ is to flow over into us, that we may live, move and be in him, and by faith be one heart, one soul with him, and thus become living members of his body.

This is no exaggeration, but the scriptural representation of an important, precious truth, which offers to us poor, unworthy beings, the highest honor and the most exalted dignity, of which we are capable. We are, of course not to become one with Christ in the sense that we are to cease to be finite beings and self-conscious personalities, and to be swallowed up in him as the drops in the ocean; still, on the other hand, we are not to reverence him only as the divine Founder of our Holy Religion, agreeing with his doctrines and views, as the Jews with Moses, the Mahomedans with Mahomet. Much more does the New Testament represent, in innumerable passages, the relation of the Redeemed to the Redeemer as an actual and real *life union*. Our Saviour represents himself as the vine, his disciples the branches, who derive power and support from Him, and sundered from him, must cease to exist and wither and become irrecoverably lost. He is the eternal life, he that believeth in Him, hath everlasting life, he that believeth not the Son, hath not life. In the great judgment day, the Saviour will regard himself in such close, intimate union with his own, that he will regard their sufferings and wants while in the world, as his own, and will say, “Whatsoever ye did to the least of these my Brethren, ye did unto me.” We are challenged to eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, that is, to take up in us his life, if we are true disciples, and desire finally to have part in the Resurrection. We are called members of His Body, in whom also his life-blood circulates—and are penetrated by his life, and ruled by his Will—“Christ is my life,” says the Apostle, “I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of

God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." "When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in Glory." Paul, by using so frequently the expression "in Christ," does not thereby merely regard Him as Mediator, much less as Instrument, but as the life-element, in which the faithful stand,—have their entire spiritual existence, and in which all duty is to be performed.

What a glorious and magnificent calling is thus presented to us! Christ, the Son of God, and Son of man,—the Saviour of the World,—the Lord of Lords—is not ashamed to call us his friends and his Bretheren! And his beloved Apostle assures us that, "we shall be like Him, and shall see Him as he is!" Let us adore therefore, in humility and take shame to ourselves, that we have preserved and respected our christian name so little, and in so many instances have contradicted it in thought, word and deed.

Although every one is now called to such indescribable honor, yet he cannot, as a single individual attain to this, except in living communion with the Holy Catholic Church, as a Member of the Body of Christ. In the *Church*, we have the union of the divine and human with all its excellence, represented far more fully and clearly than in any single individual saint, however distinguished for piety. She, and not the individual soul, is called therefore the Lamb's Bride, whom the Bridegroom adorns with the most costly apparel, the Body of Jesus Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. We are now members of the Body, and must remain in organic union with it, if we are to be healthy, and thriving. Fundamentally, there is no difference between genuine godliness (*christlichkeit*) and churchliness, they are intimately related, as Christ and his Church, as Body and Soul. Where the two come into conflict, there must be at bottom a misconception, or a sickly state of piety. He that fancies he can either in separatistic pride, or monkish withdrawal from the world, separated from historical christianity, from the Church, founded and guided by the Holy Ghost, work out to better advantage, the salvation of his Soul, must suffer this error severely, depriving himself of innumerable blessings, and robbing himself of all power and strength. Even open imperfections and diseases, which often intrude into the church, without ability to destroy her existence or essence, afford no sufficient ground to separate from her, but are only a more powerful challenge for patience, prayer, effort and fidelity. Certainly deep love to Christ always brings with it love for his church, and he that understands the nature of humility and love, and anticipates

the truth of the mystery of the communion of saints, cannot otherwise, but look forward with reverence and free obedience to the great cloud of witnesses of the past,—to the invisible yet at the same time visible church, which the Lord of heaven and earth has chosen as his Bride. Alas! it is too true, that in reality, we have a false Churchliness at the expense of being Christ-like, and a false likeness to Christ, which intrudes into the place of Churchliness. The true and sound view is only in such a union of both, where one loves the Church, not as an abstraction, a phantasy, but as the actual, historical Church, founded and directed by Christ,—loved in him and for his sake; yea with that love with which he loved her, and bought her with his own precious blood; and where the united voice of christendom receives a voluntary audience, and an intelligent regard, and the general reason is elevated above the particular, the whole above the parts, and the body above its members.

If this be now the proper relation, it follows, that the individual christian is able to develop and perfect his christian character in a sound way only in that degree in which he lives in the communion of saints, and employs the means of Grace, which God has ordered in his Church, which are our daily spiritual food, and are to nourish and advance the new life commenced within, till he has grown to the statue of a perfect man in Christ Jesus. As no member, sundered from the Body, no branch separated from the tree, can thrive or grow, so on the other hand can no single individual come to perfection, before the whole Body has reached it. The perfection or completion of individual piety falls in with the upbuilding and triumph of the Church. "It does not yet appear, what we shall be." When the Lord shall come again, and the new Jerusalem in bridal apparel shall advance toward Him, then shall we also, as individual Jewels in the same attire reflect his glory, then shall "we be like Him,"—then shall the deep glorious significance of our christian name be first perfectly realized and understood.

§2. If we inquire now in the second place, into the office of Christ, to deduce the office and duties of the christian, we find it to consist in this, that he is in a perfect sense the *Prophet, Priest and King* of Humanity. Christ, or as the Hebrew expression has it, *Messiah*, means the *Anointed* of God, furnished with the Holy Ghost without measure. In the Old Testament the three servants of the Theocracy, Prophet, Priest and King, were anointed, and thereby were consecrated exclusively to the service of God, and qualified to fulfil their Holy Functions in the kingdom of God. These three Offices and Functions were

in the highest sense united in our Redeemer, and are to proceed from him, in a relative sense, upon all his disciples. For this purpose John speaks of the anointing, which we received from the Lord, and which remains with us. Also the Heidelberg Catechism answers so beautifully and appropriately, the 32nd question: "Why are you called a christian? Because I am a member of Christ by faith, and thus am partaker of his anointing, that so I may confess his name, and present myself a living sacrifice of thankfulness to him; and also with a free and good conscience I may fight against sin and satan in this life, and afterward reign with him eternally, over all creatures."

I. Christ is the highest *Prophet*, in that he has perfectly revealed to us the Truth and Will of God in his Words and his Miracles, so that we cannot expect a deeper explanation of divine things beyond Him. In the Old Testament, Moses and the Prophets spoke of him: he has however gathered together in himself all the scattered rays of revelation then preparing—and these enriched now shine forth from his divine-human Person. "No one has seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." He is the Light of the World, the Personal Truth, the Centre, the sun of all Truth, having reference to our eternal salvation, and in him are contained, as the apostle says, all the treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.

Man was created in the image of God, also in Truth and for Truth. In him the hidden sense of nature comes to consciousness; he is the interpreter of its mysteries, the organ of its mute wonders; he elevates himself at the same time above nature, and soars, in virtue of his inherent God-consciousness and knowledge to the contemplation of the Creator and Preserver of all things. But this original light of Paradise has been obscured by means of the fall; he has sunk himself into the life of nature, and though here and there, in his condition, a few separated rays of this higher knowledge break through this night of sin, and he can never wholly deny his divine origin, still it is only as a weak twilight or a stellar glare in the deepest midnight. By means of his departure from the source of all Truth, he lost the true knowledge of himself, the world—and of God; and the divine image in him now lies in ruins. This Christ has first restored and brought to light perfectly in every point of view.

The regenerated individual, or the christian in the true sense of the word, is enlightened by the Holy Ghost, is surrounded by the Light of the Gospel in which he learns to know himself,—God in his Omnipotence, Eternity, Glory, Justice, Love and

Grace. Jesus Christ as the only ground of salvation, the Way, the Truth and the Life. In this knowledge he is to grow daily, always to penetrate deeper into the hidden meaning of God's word, to go from one degree of truth to another, until he comes to see face to face, as he is known by the Omniscent One. Still this is not enough. As a Prophet he dare not keep to himself the treasures of wisdom, which alone can make wise to everlasting salvation, but according to the example of Christ, he gives them to the world, he lets his light shine before men, and acknowledges his divine master in word and deed, before old and young, great and small, high and low. "He that confesses me before men, him will I confess before my Father who is in heaven; he that denies me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven." This is spoken, not only to those that are called to be public teachers in a particular sense, but to all christians. As they are all taught of God, so also should all, each in his sphere and according to the grace and opportunity granted him by means of their testimony and example lead others, Children and Parents, Brethren and Sisters, Friends and Foes, to that source of Life and of Truth.

II. Christ is the true *Priest*, that is, the only Mediator between God and man, who having consecrated himself wholly to God and Humanity by means of his one sacrifice upon the Cross, has wrought out an everlasting salvation, and by his Intercession before the throne of our Father and his Father, and perpetually represents us, so that the shafts of his penal justice do not touch us, and on account of the will of his only begotten Son, he lifts upon us his reconciled countenance and accepts us as his children, and as heirs of eternal salvation.

In this we as christians are to become like unto our Saviour, and as it were continue his Priestly office. In a state of innocence, man was in an undeveloped sense a Priest, and stood in one view mediating between heaven and earth uttering not only his prayer of praise, but also so to speak, as the representative of nature, forming its life into a Psalm of thanksgiving and sacrificing on the altar of the Most High; to Whom the birds in the air, the fish in the sea, yea, even the worm upon the earth, through the mediation of human consciousness, render praise and prayer.

This priestly office of the first Adam, defaced by means of sin, has been restored far more gloriously in the second Adam and in him has been perfectly realized. True, we are no mediators in one sense of the term, and we cannot reconcile ourselves nor others to God. This position and honor belongs alone to

Christ. But he will use us as instruments, to introduce his forever accomplished work of Redemption into the consciousness of man, and to spread his blessings farther and farther. We are all called to be Priests in the sense, that as He did, so we are to consecrate ourselves unreservedly to Him, with all that we have and all that we are, as well as to the welfare of humanity. We have no right to life, and our earthly existence has no reasonable sense and end, except as we live for the glory of God, and for the good of his church. This is the highest ornament of humanity, and its true glory; every thing else appears trifling, and leads only to destruction. In the same measure in which we live for this exalted purpose have we a claim to that piety and morality, which can stand finally before the tribunal of the great Judge. In self-love, in the service of self and the world consists the peculiar essence of sin; the unconditional surrendry of heart and will to God, the perfect self-consecration and disinterested love to him, and humanity, constitute real virtue and godliness, the fulfilling of the law and the prophets, the sum of practical christianity. Yea we are to offer our bodies, according to Paul, as living, sacred and well pleasing sacrifices to God and all its members as instruments of righteousness. "Ye are," says the Apostle Peter to the faithful, "a chosen generation, a royal Priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." Praise and thanksgiving for all blessings and favors, supplications and intercessions for all classes and wants of humanity, Property and Life, Body and Soul,—these are the acceptable offerings which we are called upon to bring daily and hourly before God and his people. This is the reasonable service of the christian—this his purest joy, this his unspeakable gain. He that seeks his life for its own sake shall loose it, he that looses his life for the sake of God and his Church shall find it glorified, and immeasurably more valuable.

III. Finally, Christ is King of this spiritual Kingdom which comprehends heaven and earth, and endures to all eternity. "Yet have I set my King upon the Holy hill of Zion," says the Psalmist in reference to the Messiah. According to his human nature, he descended from royal blood, a branch from the root of Jesse. "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel," as Nathanael accosted him at his first interview. This kingly honor shone forth in his deepest humiliation; yea Pilate the Gentile, became an unconscious witness of the truth, because he had placed upon the cross the superscription, in three lan-

guages, "this is the king of the Jews." But not of the Jews only! When he ascended on high, he said of himself, "To me is given all power on earth and in heaven," and now he is exalted to the right hand of God, the Father, "above all thrones, principalities, powers, might, authority, and every thing that can be named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." He is placed "head over all things to the church, which is his body the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Yea, his name is according to Revelation "the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords."

Now as the prophetic and priestly functions, are essential elements of the divine image in us, so is also the kingly function. Even the erect appearance, the noble forehead, the flashing eye, much more the exalted spirit and imperious will of man declare his kingly descent and honor. He is the crown of creation, the Lord of nature, so to speak, the representative of God on earth. Therefore all power on earth was given to our first parents in Paradise, over the fish of the sea, the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field and all creeping things. "Thou makest him ruler over the works of thy hands," exclaims the Psalmist, in humble astonishment at this kingly honor, and in reference to the completion of the original creation by Christ, he said, "thou hast placed all things under his feet, sheep and oxen, also the wild beasts, the birds under heaven, and the fish in the sea, and all that pass therein."

How deeply has not man fallen from this exalted position! He, the royal Son, a poor slave of sin, the world and the devil, the sport of his lusts and unsanctified affections, which in spite of all outward power and glory, with which he is surrounded, often sinks himself beneath the level of the brute! O the ignominy, the shame upon the immortal spirit—upon the master-work of his creative power! True, here and there the rays of his glory break forth, and he manifests his superiority over nature in art and inventions, and he makes subservient to himself, the hidden treasures of the earth, and annihilates space and time. In the midst of his deepest fall, amidst his external slavery to sin, remain the painful remembrance of the Palace, which he abandoned—of the diadem which he wore—of the glory which surrounded him, and a desire, a longing for his Father's house, and the repossession of Paradise. But by means of these weak remains, he is not able to break the chains which he has forged, to separate himself from the service of his companions of shame, to which he has, in a terrible manner joined himself.

Through Christ alone we have Redemption from the power

of sin and satan. Whom the Son makes free he shall be free indeed, and he that does not possess this freedom, remains a slave though in golden chains. Christ, the king of heaven, which is not of, but in the world, has procured for us much more honor and dignity, by his glorious Resurrection and Ascension, than we lost through Adam, "and made us spiritual Kings and Priests," if by faith we are espoused to Him. For he that is in living union with the divine-human person has part in his kingly power and majesty. This character the christian is called upon to exercise by subduing his evil desires and lusts, whose slave he is by nature, through a victorious contest against flesh and blood, against the temptations of the world and the assaults of satan. The Apostle exhorts: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." We are also challenged to the conquest against the princes and powers of the world dwelling in darkness, against the wicked spirits in the world. That servant, overcoming his affections, who has learned the great art of self-government in the school of Jesus Christ, is more free and stronger than the richest prince or conqueror, that is under this power. As Christ passed through suffering into his glory—through contests to the eternal victory over sin, death and the grave, so must also the christian reach the same mark, in the same manner. Here his royal honor is hidden from the eyes of the world, but "the christians internal light shines, although scorched externally, by the rays of the sun;" and when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory—"If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him." "He that overcometh, to him will I give to sit with Me on My throne; even as I have overcome and am seated with my Father on his throne."

This is now an imperfect sketch of the three-fold honor conferred on him, that bears the name of the Saviour of the world not in vain. But this can manifest itself in the individual christian only so far as he is a living member of the body of Christ. The *whole congregation* of believers has a right to this appellation—to be the full and perfect bearer of this triple dignity. She, the church of God, is in a far higher sense, than any separate organ or representative, the Prophet—the great Teacher of Nations—"the pillar and ground of the Truth,"—she is the Priest, who points the impenitent to Christ—bringing daily and hourly sacrifices and thanks, prayers and intercessions to the honor of God and the salvation of the world: she, is the King, whom the Lord has elevated to be his bride and given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the dispensing of blessings and

curses in his name and by his authority. For this reason are we commanded to employ our Prophetical, Priestly and Kingly functions not beyond, much less in contact with the one, holy, universal Church of Jesus Christ, but in a living union and particular subordination to her, who is the mother of us all, by whom we are trained to these three offices and honors. In this view we can only become perfect with the whole body—here genuine godliness and sound churchliness fall together and go hand in hand.

If we draw now in conclusion a few *practical reflections* respecting the meaning of the christian name, which must be done briefly, above all others we should in the first place *humble and cover ourselves with shame*, because we are all so far removed from this moral height and glory, to which, by the grace of God, we have been called, and which our name makes continually binding upon us, and which should be the aim of our highest and most earnest endeavors. Yea, how many are there, who are wholly unworthy of the christian name, who have buried their anointing to the prophetical, priestly and kingly offices, which they received in holy baptism, in their sins and unbelief! Such may well tremble and quake. For unless they speedily repent, their christian name which should be their pride and crown, will condemn them before the bar of God, and thus instead of a blessing, become a curse to them. If we are really in earnest with the salvation of our souls, and truly repent of our sins and infirmities, our christian name will serve as *comfort and encouragement* to still greater *exertion in holiness*. There is nothing more elevated and glorious than the destination of humanity, as represented in christianity, for this shows it to be the true and perfect religion. We poor sinners, we worms of the dust are called through Christ of pure mercy to the highest honor and dignity of which any creation can be capable. Our destination seems to surpass even that of the angels, for the Son of God did not take upon himself the nature of angels, but of man, and has forever united our nature to the divine. Here to every one the highest view is opened—a way—a crown which far surpasses the renown and honor of the Statesman—the Warrior—the Philosopher—the Artist, and yet open to the poorest, by an abiding, living faith in the Person of Jesus Christ, Our Lord. O let us then adore in the dust of humility—upon our knees give thanks to him for his unspeakable love, and with all our powers, early and late, by day and night, in joy and in sorrow, in thought, word and deed, reach after that which is requir-

ed from us, by our christian name, already demanded and impressed upon us as our destination in our baptismal vows, namely, really men of God, Prophets, Priests and Kings of the Triune God, blessed for evermore!

Translated from Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfreund, by

J. W. S.

CHRISTIAN PRAYER.

John xvi : 24. And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you.

THE sense of a relation to their Creator and Governor can never be wholly removed from the minds of men. The character of this relation however has been differently understood.

There are those who acknowledge no need of a Mediator, who may stand between heaven and earth. God it is said, has established in the world, a moral constitution. Obedience to this brings happiness, while disobedience is followed with misery. Each individual is to make the best avail, possible under the circumstances, of his abilities and natural talents. Diligence and activity will secure large a reward of temporal good, and the process of life, as thus conducted, will be at the same time the preparation for the higher world of existence, into which the human spirit is to be carried after Death. The end of earth is the beginning of Heaven. "Man the arbiter of his own destiny" is the watchword of the true warrior in the hurried contests on the battle field of Time. The intelligent creature, in connection with the whole created world, is indeed in a general sense dependent upon the Creator. The Universe is upheld by Him in existence. In the human will, however, there is no room for such dependence. God is removed from any immediate concern in human events. The individual is free, independent, and is left to himself to determine by his actions, for weal or wo, the condition of his present and future being.

In this theory no regard is had of course to the mystery of sin. Wherever any sense is felt of the terrible lie in which our nature stands by reason of the original apostacy of the race, the

thought of such independence of the Author and Preserver of our being, is looked upon as blindness and folly. Yet here again, it is possible, even with a sense of human misery and want, to disallow the mediatorial economy of the Gospel. On the ground of the relation between God and his creatures, in the original creation, men still, although sinners, are permitted and encouraged to appear in the Divine Presence and can take to themselves the full assurance of favor and paternal regard from the merciful Father of all.

The Gospel while, on the one hand, it excludes the thought of Stoic self-dependence, on the other it equally rejects the unwarrantable trust of the Socinian and acknowledges no way of approach with peace, into the saving Presence of the Most High except in the Mediator of the New Covenant, and the Church from the beginning has been offering her worship to the Triune Jehovah, in the name of Him who is both the Son of God and the Son of Man. So that whatever we need in our souls or in our bodies, we are not to resolve to gain by labor and care, but in the spirit of little children, with a sense of utter helplessness and child-like inability, to trust our Heavenly Father to give us all temporal and spiritual mercies, as we have no power to make a single effort to gain them for ourselves. This trust in our Father in Heaven, which leads to christian prayer and christian living, is in the Gospel, always in the Divine, Human Mediator, whose birth and abiding presence in the world is the glad tidings of peace on earth and good will to men.

It would seem that a necessity exists in the constitution of the Godhead that the relation between God and his creatures should be through a Mediator. The mysterious essence of Jehovah, dwelling in the awful abyss of Eternity, in the process of distinction into three Persons, is revealed, made conscious to itself, not in the Father or in the Spirit, but in the Son, who is on this account called the Word. The word and thought in the human mind are held together in living union. The one is not possible without the other. And the word from our lips is the revelation to ourselves and to our fellow men of the character and meaning of our life. The real word of a man, must necessarily make known the full meaning of his interior being. In the mysterious processes imminent in the Divine Essence in Eternity the Divine Existence is revealed to itself in the generation of the Son, and only in Him, as the Word of God, could the eternal Father create the worlds and only in Him could His life-giving and sustaining presence be at hand for His Creatures. The full presence of God to man could also only be possible in

the event of the Word entering into the world, and thus carrying the Divine Essence into our nature. The Triune God is not revealed in Creation, nor even in the Shechinah of the Tabernacle. In the Person of the Word made Flesh, dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, for the first time for men. The fulness here is the actual presence of the Eternal Essence of Jehovah. Eternity brought into union with Time, the kingdom of Heaven set up on Earth. So that it would seem in the constitution of the Divine nature, there exists a necessity that we should appear before our Heavenly Father through a Mediator. It is a mere fancy then, a pure delusion in the mind of those who affect to offer worship to God, as if He were directly and at once the universal Father of men, and think to receive directly from Him divine blessing and grace.

It does not indeed require that we should first have a sound reason, in the way of argument, on the ground of which we may feel at liberty to exercise trust in this form in the Author and Preserver of our being. For this the testimony of the Divine Word, when once clearly made out is of itself sufficient, even in the absence of every kind of supplementary evidence. And it will always be of the highest account to keep steadily fixed in mind, that the practice of the church in praying through the Son, has grown out of the clear, explicit authority of the written Word. Yet if it can be seen, that this arrangement as made known in the Gospel, does not merely rest upon Divine appointment, but has an absolute necessity, both in the constitution of the divine and human nature, it must tend greatly to build up and confirm the wavering faith of our unbelieving hearts. For a supernatural revelation, while it transcends, must, to have the possibility of being accredited to the faith of men, conform to and be in perfect harmony throughout, with the established order of Nature and History. The system of nature and the institutions of society are however a process of mediation, in which our bodily and intellectual existence is begotten and developed to its perfect state. The life of the body, and no less the life of the soul is not a new creation brought about by Divine power exerted from Heaven in the case of each individual, but a generation accomplished through natural causes. Yet the connection between cause and effect always holds in the power of the Divine Will, not as if brought to bear from beyond the skies, but as at hand in the world, in virtue of the presence of the Word. The question, though wrongly propounded by the skeptic, may still be properly enough asked, Whether power does inhere in the creature, natural or human, and not

rather in the presence of the Creator, and in the creature as an instrument. It would seem at any rate, that human activity is not the cause of results that may follow but merely the occasion. In the labors of the husbandman for instance, it is clearly evident, that there is no necessary connection, at least so far as his own mind and will are concerned, between the preparing of the ground and the sowing of the seed in Autumn, and the harvest of the Summer. The process of growth that is to follow, after the seed has been deposited in the earth is regularly brought about, through agencies however, lying for the most part beyond his knowledge and acting entirely independent of his will. In the first place, can he bring to hand even the conditions, through the presence of which alone, it is possible that growth may commence. For this, are needed the constant supplies of light, heat and moisture, and these in proper quantity and at proper time. The constant presence, as also the constant absence of light, would be alike deleterious to all kinds of vegetable and animal existence, and would necessarily induce a large amount of suffering. But this alternate succession of light and darkness comes regularly to pass; day after day, we see the sun rising in the East and journeying to the West, thus performing over our heads during every twenty-four hours a stupendous miracle, as much to be wondered at, as when at the word of the servant of the Lord, it stood still upon Gibeon, in the midst of the heavens, and hasted not to go down for the space of a day. The round of the seasons too is a magnificent process accomplished in the period of the year. The melancholy decay of Autumn, the stern desolation of Winter, the reviving warmth of Spring, the maturing heat of Summer, come and go at their appointed time. The forces at work in nature producing these changes, are in this way making present the necessary conditions of growth. But with the conditions at hand, there is still in the growth itself of the simplest flower of the plain, a mystery that transcends our understanding. The wisest philosopher cannot tell to his fellow-men, how the germ of life latent in the seed unfolds from one stage to another, until it reaches the matured state. The labor of the husbandman is not the cause of the results that may follow thereupon, but only the condition. Can the will of man make the sun to rise and set, and the seasons to run their rounds? and can he make the germs of life in nature to unfold to full maturity, through the mysterious process of growth? The kindly fruits of the earth by which our bodies are clothed and fed, are brought not by our labor and toil, but are supplied from the bounteous storehouse of nature. The Divine Word

made all things that were made, and upholds all things in heaven and upon earth. So that the second Person of the ever-adorable Trinity is here already, the Mediator between God and Men, through whom comes all temporal good. Our daily food and raiment are brought to us by Him, and in that He has taught us to pray "Give us this day our daily bread," it is implied we have no power to obtain it of ourselves.

Then again have we any power to produce the growth of our own body? Who can add a single cubit to his stature? or change the color of a hair of his head? We are indeed to observe the conditions of health, but can do nothing besides. The flow of the red currents of life from the beating heart, the breathing of the lungs, and all the various processes taking place within our physical frame are carried on from moment to moment, independent of the action of the will, whether this be stirred up to manly energy, or may be lying powerless in the death of sleep.

If we be thus dependent and without power the proper order for us would be to withdraw trust from ourselves and to look to God for life and health, and to have faith in Him as he is present in nature through the Word. This is prayer—and labor would be in this case the certain evidence that Faith was real. For labor would then be carried forward, not with the spirit of a man of the world, but merely as the means through which natural blessings would be surely received in a Divine Providence.

The world of History again, like that of Nature, is the visible Presence of the Divine Word, but in a different form and for a different purpose. This Presence, here, as before, necessarily brings those who are brought to feel it divine blessings; not now, physical for the body, but intellectual and spiritual for the reason and faith of men. There is still greater necessity that these should be brought from abroad to the individual, than was found to be the case in the acquirement of merely natural good. He who cannot make a single blade of grass to grow, nor add a cubit to his stature, is much less prepared to form the character and carry forward the development of his interior being. The exercises for mental and religious training in the family and in the school do not of themselves in the way of cause produce mental and religious culture, but properly take only the place of an occasion. As rational and moral, the human subject is required to come into the possession of knowledge in his understanding and righteousness in his will. "These treasures of wisdom and knowledge," and we may add of righteousness, being "hid in Christ Jesus," they are not to be *acquired*, but to be

received as a gift from God ; a gift however always conveyed through human institutions, and in these, upon the use of appointed means on the part of the receiving subject. The family is so ordered in its constitution as actually to make present and thus to reveal, the Life, and with it the Mind of the Divine Word, in the natural and spiritual birth and education of individual human and christian existence. " In the Word was Life, and that was the Light of Men," and all derived existence must come from Him. This does not fall directly by spiritual afflatus from the clouds, anew in the case of each individual, but is produced through generation from out the general order of human existence already at hand through the original Creation. Neither does spiritual life in regeneration fall from heaven, but is, as it is called, a generation out of the world of spiritual existence, at hand, through the second Creation. So that, as in the language not only of the Fathers, and medieval doctors, but also of the Reformers, the Church is truly the Mother of all the faithful. Individual existence is indeed distinct, individual and personal, yet is always comprehended in a life broader than itself, out of which it has been produced, and only by remaining continually rooted in which it can continue to exist and be brought to a perfect state. But for this very reason the meaning, end of such separate, single existence, does not lie in what may happen to be the mind and will of the individual himself, but rather in the deeper purpose, present in the Divine mind, as this underlies and at the same time is unfolded for the knowledge of men, in the growth of families and nations. These institutions constitute in fact, the living process, in which the revelation of the Divine character and will is being accomplished. So that the family and the nation, as they are standing at any given time, may be said to carry in their own bosom, in a certain sense, the very mind of God, and do so, from the fact, that they embody previously the Presence of God. And it is not possible to come into the possession of the Divine mind, nor to be found living in the Divine Presence, except as we are carried up livingly in these institutions, by the continued process of healthy intellectual and spiritual growth, through the successive stages of human existence. In the Family and in the Nation we receive life, are born ; and in them, are enshrined for us the treasures of knowledge and righteousness. These, *hid* in Christ, come thus to be revealed, so that being reproduced in our own growth, we are brought to dwell in Truth and in Life. Moreover these institutions are not only the store-houses, in which are contained earthly and heavenly treasures, but are constructed throughout to fit

into our intellectual and spiritual being. The structure of the natural world is in perfect harmony with the framework of our bodily life. So much is this found to be the case, that a change in the proportion of the elements composing the atmosphere would necessarily make our existence miserable. Should the axis of the earth, instead of being inclined, be brought to lie in the plane of its orbit, it would bring at once to an end the magnificent cycle of the seasons, and give rise to another order of nature that might produce jarring and discord at every point. That man is required by painful effort, with the sweat of his brow, to bring his life into almost even the least degree of harmony with the constituted order of the physical universe, results from the presence of sin, through which he has lost the Paradisaic state of his being, wherein the wild beasts of the field, lay harmless at his feet, and the earth yielded spontaneously its kindly fruits. In like manner, the structure of the moral and spiritual world is in complete harmony with our intellectual and spiritual nature, and for this reason human relationships, when holding in their normal form, are not arbitrary arrangements of human contrivance for mutual benefit and convenience, but rather, are in their own constitution the divinely appointed order of personal existence, through which, this is to be borne upward into the blessedness of immortality. "Human relationships are not artificial types of something divine, but are actually the means, *and the only means*, through which man ascends to any knowledge of the divine; and every breach of a human relation, as it implies a violation of the higher law, so also is a hinderance and barrier to the perception of that higher law,—the drawing a veil between the spirit of a man and his God." The name father is a title given on the ground of an actual relation. As God is the Father of all men, they, who are allowed to bear this divine name on earth, must for the time be actually invested with the divine character and embody in themselves under a human form the presence of God, and there is no room for the child to come into this divine presence, except, as it enters, through filial trust on the one hand and parental affection on the other, into unreserved communion and sympathy with the mind and will of the parents. Thus being taught to acknowledge, through filial trust and obedience, earthly parental government, the subject comes gradually to the recognition of a personal connection in the paternal government of God over men. Other human relations are not any less real. The Prophet, Priest and King have not first manufactured their offices by craft, and afterwards filled them for profit. In the Jewish theocracy these were

ordained with sacred anointing, and were only considered faithful, in as far as they felt all their power to come, not from themselves, but from the mysterious presence of Jehovah in the symbol of the Shechinah, from whose servants, standing before that tabernacle in which the Lord dwelt, they had received anointing.

To understand the influence of the relationships in the family, we have need to consider only the actual facts, that are presented in society. Nothing is more common than to observe striking resemblances between those thus bound together. These are to be seen in the features of the countenance, in the tones of the voice, the general air and carriage, and even extend over into the intellectual and spiritual being, in a peculiar cast of mind, and tone of moral and religious thought and affection. How these come to exist is indeed a mystery, yet it is evidently brought about not from beyond, but within the family; of course by a divine hand, acting however, it would seem, in the thinking and willing of the Parent. So it is well known, that certain diseases both of body and of mind are often hereditary, moral traits of character too, vices and virtues are seen frequently to continue in families for generations. This appears to be the fulfillment of those awful words on the table of Commandments, the iniquities of the father, both original and actual, shall descend upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation. From the parental constitution, in itself considered, it is absolutely impossible that it should be otherwise, although it never can be so actually. For the redeeming grace present in the surrounding community reaches over more or less fully into all the families within its bosom, and extends a parental solicitude around those who have become orphans, by either the bodily or spiritual death of their parents. From such considerations, it is evident, that the family must be a divine institution and contain the Divine Presence, so that it is in fact a process of Mediation, by which temporal and spiritual blessings are to be received. There are other relationships, springing from the constitution of the state, through which the human spirit is carried upward into a full harmony with the Divine Will, and into full communion with the Divine Mind. The distribution of the human world into the forms of national existence is not an accident, nor a mere arrangement of human wisdom, but has an inward necessity in the life of the world itself. It is impossible to understand the origin and purpose of national institutions, or to find any meaning in History generally, except as we are prepared beforehand to see in it the evolution of a Divine Mystery, and thus to

acknowledge at the same time a Divine factor working in and through a free human agency in the accomplishment of earthly events. The division of the human family into the different races, cannot be accounted for, with any degree of satisfaction, from a change in outward circumstances, and is utterly unintelligible on the theory that the will of man is the ruling power in the production of events. It must be certainly from the working of a Divine hand, that those born in a certain region of the globe and from among a certain portion of the human family, upon being compared with those in other geographical limits, and from another race, should be found to be by birth of a different colour, with different outward features; a different structure throughout of the physical frame, as seen especially in the formation of the skull, thus indicating a different structure still deeper in the interior and spiritual being. And within these historically formed castes, into which individual men are born and in which they must dwell in time at least,—within these again, there are mysterious distinctions; whole classes of individuals are arranged into separate communities, each clearly distinguished from the other. The citizens of a particular nation are born into a peculiar order of intellectual and spiritual existence. They are comprehended in a community of feeling, of interest, and of purpose, are ruled by a common spirit, and working out, unconsciously or not as it may happen, a common end. Collectively in their national capacity, they are appointed to solve a given problem, it may be in practical life, in art, or in science. There will be unity of character, in those dwelling on one soil, and this because there is unity of life, out of which they have been begotten. There is a peculiar style of dress, and a general air that is national. The works of art are distinct, and the poems of a people especially have the expression of a national spirit. Science, even natural, but particularly ethical and political is widely distinct at any one time, and above all when nations of different ages are compared together. The distinction here, then, as in the family, lies in the intelligence and moral feeling of the individual, in his inward, and spiritual being. This is reflected clearly in the national language, which embodies the national reason, and contains, in one view at least, its intellectual and spiritual wealth.

As the etymology of the word imports, the nations holding the mind and life of the world at any given time have been brought into existence in the way of birth from the womb of the past. They spring forth always out of the ruins of that order of thought and will, in which the human spirit had been

for centuries previously comprehended. The dissolution of the wornout forms, in which the soul has for ages been dwelling is at the same time the birth of new institutions, that become a new habitation for the spirit. In these are to be seen the struggles of the human soul to realize its own meaning and proper life. The vast processes that form the way to the accomplishment of this result, as they succeed each other like the waves of the sea, have beneath the surface an inward connection. But outward traces and marks also of a deep bond of union in the succession of national institutions from one age to another are furnished in the researches of philology. It seems now to be settled that the Sanskrit of Hindostan is the parent of the entire Indo-Germanic family. The Persian, Latin, Greek and Teutonic, although widely separated in geographical and political relations, have a common origin, and are bound together in affinity by birth. A peculiar inward and outward structure of intellectual and moral existence reaches out with colossal proportions, from ancient India, across Asia and Europe to the shores of the great Pacific. Here is an order of civilization, peculiar to itself,—an order of civilization carrying forward in its course the most magnificent creation of the soul in politics, in art and science, that starting on the banks of the Ganges has been moving Westward, forming the central stream of the world's life: including the world historical nationalities of Gentilism, first India and then Persia the depositories of the rich treasures of oriental learning and wisdom, then in Greece and Rome, the depositories again of the Literature of the orient, under a renovated form: after this, through the universal spread of the Greek language at the time of the introduction of the Gospel-Era, receiving into its bosom, the whole wealth of the literature of the Semitic Family, especially the treasures enshrined in the Hebrew Commonwealth, all of which were transfused from the Semitic, over into the Romanic and Germanic nationalities, that have risen upon the soil of Europe, and in which is rolling forward majestically the river of Incarnate Truth and Life, with Paradise on its banks. And there can be no intelligence on the part of the individual, and no moral culture, except as he grows into that world of intelligence and life lying around him in the institutions of society. To be comprehended in the relations of the Family as produced in History, is actually to stand, in *Virtue* already of birth, in the world of Truth, and Knowledge. And through the relationship of the nation, the individual is still more borne upwards into the realms of reason and celestial glory. To stand outside of society is to be intellectually and morally in the

position of the savage, and leads to death in arbitrary self-will.

Human Reason both in its constitution and history forms a process of mediation in which is brought to pass the birth and growth of the human soul to the freedom of Immortality. The inexhaustible fountain of this glorious world of Truth and Life is the Divine Reason and Will in the Person of the Eternal Word. There is a tendency in all spheres of life, natural and human, to seek a centre on which to be supported. Such centres are found by the Geologist already in the creations of both vegetable and animal existence. The family carries in itself evidently the same character, and in every community there are particular individuals, on whom for the most part its life and activity seem to be poised, and the nation will always produce personal bearers of its life, appointed to utter the national thought and will; and, as since the Christian Era, a supernatural economy, broad as the earth, has been taking deep root in the natural and spiritual world, every Christian age produces those, who are constituted by birth and education, representatives between heaven and earth; the central personality from whom the whole world of intelligence and will springs is Jesus the Son of God. In Him too all the lines of History meet.

The Human Family undeveloped starts in unity and in the course of evolution is subjected for four thousand years to a process of division. These distinct races, comprised mainly at the end of this period, of the Indo-Germanic and Semitic are united in Christ in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek. History since the Gospel, is not as before a process of division but of union. The divisions now are not into races (parts of the one race) on the plane of humanity, but into Churches (parts of the one Church) in the plane of Christianity. This process of development both ante-Christian, and Christian is to end in the developed unity of the Human Family in the new heavens and new earth. And Christian worship is offered in the name of the Son, as in Him the world of nature is created and upheld and around Him the world of Human Reason in its constitution and history revolves as its eternal centre.

KITTO'S CYCLOPÆDIA.

The Popular Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By JOHN KITTO, D. D., F. S. A., Author of the 'Pictorial Bible' &c.; assisted by the Rev. JAMES TAYLOR, D. D., of Glasgow. *Illustrated by numerous engravings.* Boston: Published by Gould & Lincoln, 1851. Pp. 800, 8vo.

THOUGH itself a pretty large work, this volume is condensed for popular use from a larger publication, the "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," which was designed to furnish a Dictionary of the Bible, we are told, for the libraries of ministers and theological students—"not framed, as others had been, out of old materials, but embodying the products of the best and most recent researches in Biblical Literature," as they have been carried forward in different parts of the Christian world. With this larger work we are not directly acquainted; it is represented however as being altogether of a much higher order than any other publication of the same general class which has yet appeared, being the result of an immense labor and research, and keeping full pace throughout with the advanced biblical and theological knowledge of the present day. Dr. Kitto is merely the Editor of the work; its contents are made up mainly by contributions from distinguished scholars, whose names are for the most part a sufficient guaranty that the subjects on which they write are handled in a truly learned way. Among the contributors we notice several leading theologians of Germany, and two or three of some note from the United States. In the nature of the case, the articles thus furnished cannot all be of the same merit, and different shades of theology may come here and there slightly into view; although the purely literary character of most of the topics is a protection against this to a great extent. The present abridgement is intended to include all the matter of the larger work that is suited to popular and general use, and to meet in this way the wants of the great body of the religious public. "In the work as it here stands, is offered such an exhibition of the results of large research, without the details and authorities, as could not, it is believed, have been produced, had not the larger Cyclopædia previously existed, and its valuable materials been made available for this service. Drawn from such a source, it is believed that this Abridgement will possess the same superiority over *Popular Cyclopædias* of this class, as the original work confessedly does over those which aspire to higher erudition." It needs only a very general inspection of the book, to see that it forms a highly valuable help for popular use, in what may be termed the outward study of the Bible.

THE END OF VOLUME III.



